The Nation

Vol. CVII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1918 No. 2783

The Week

THERE is to-day not a single Associated Press correspondent in Russia, and such news as leaks out comes entirely through British sources. If we are correctly informed, the Associated Press correspondents got out of the country because of their inability to send any news through to America by cable or wireless. This is a deplorable state of affairs, for never was there a time when it was so important that we should be getting unbiased news out of that country. Everything that now comes is obviously colored and usually with the determination to paint the Bolsheviki as black as possible. Now the last thing that the *Nation* wishes to do is to defend the excesses of the Bolsheviki or to excuse them in any way. Each and every one of their outrages injures the revolution and the whole cause of liberty. But evidence does filter through that a great deal of constructive work is going on; that there is not that extreme state of terrorism and disorder which we are led to believe. But whether we are right or wrong in this, it is a great misfortune that just at this juncture we cannot find out the Bolshevist side of the case; cannot see for ourselves the decrees that they are issuing and read the newspapers that they are allowing to be printed. Nothing is more striking than the contrast between the narratives of newly returned travellers and the dispatches that we get by way of Stockholm. One thing has, however, appeared clearly from the Allied military reports, and that is that things are not going at all well in our war with Russia. The Czecho-Slovaks have been driven back at Omsk and the much-heralded new Russian Government at Ufa has fled several hundred miles from that city.

THE small neutral nations of Europe are the barometer of Germany's political strength. The claims of Denmark for a share of Schleswig, and the bank loan of a hundred million dollars which Holland's bankers have just granted to facilitate exports from the Indies to America, indicate that German power is waning. The neutrals can again act according to their own free will and they are taking advantage of the opportunity. What Denmark wants is simple and evident. It is no reopening of an old and dead issue, buried when the Schleswig-Holstein question was relegated to an obscure corner of historical handbooks, but merely a chance for the Schleswig Danes to work out their own salvation under normal and favorable conditions. As for the Dutch loan, the opening of the British Channel and the demolition of the U-boat bases on the Flemish coast have made a resumption of the Indian trade a possibility. During the war, the trade route from Amsterdam to Batavia has taken a western course. The credit arrangements made with American bankers seem to indicate that this new route has come to stay. Also it shows that Germany is no longer considered in making arrangements for the immediate future. The menace of a bullying neighbor has been removed.

THE Christian International Conference at Upsala, proposed for last April, actually opened on September 8, as we learn from M. Jules Narfon, who writes in *Figaro* in a tone skeptical but by no means hostile. The invitation to the conference, issued by the Bishop of Christiania, the Archbishop of Upsala, and the Bishop of Seeland, Denmark, emphasized the non-political character of the meeting. The subjects proposed for common prayer and conference were: (1) The spiritual unity of Christ in his disciples; (2) penitence of the church for its shortcomings; (3) the counteracting of the evil passions of war; (4) the Christian doctrine on the sanctity of law and on the work of international legislation; (5) missions. Members of each of the belligerent groups were to meet primarily with neutrals only; a general gathering was to be held only in case of complete agreement on the second point of the programme and at the desire of both sides. No votes were to be taken, no publicity was to be given to the proceedings and no statement issued unless by common agreement. M. Narfon reports that the invitation was accepted by Polish, Russian, Eastern Orthodox, and Armenian bishops, and that at a late date American, Austrian, Hungarian, and German delegates were expected. French Protestants refused categorically. In England the Council of Free Churches expressed a very limited degree of sympathy; the Congregational Union agreed to send delegates if the meeting proved possible, and the British Branch of the Universal Church Alliance and the Friends formally accepted the invitation. In March a meeting of the British Council to Promote an International Christian Meeting at Oxford was opened by the Warden of Keble College and addressed by distinguished speakers, including the Dean of Saint Paul's and Dr. Estlin Carpenter. British interest was rendered ineffective, however, by the refusal of passports.

ON the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America more than on any other one body lay the responsibility for the attitude which should be taken in America towards the proposed "Christian Stockholm." This great organization voted to take no action and requested Dr. Charles S. McFarland, its General Secretary and "Commissioner to France," to inquire into the matter. His recent statement, published on the occasion of his return, takes a purely negative attitude. He feels "quite sure that there have been efforts emanating from Germany to influence the churches of both warring and neutral countries," and states that the churches of Germany are "clearly supporting with undivided strength" the German power. He believes that such a meeting could not be free from political considerations or fail to be a peace conference. He makes no reference to feeling about the plan in any country but France and the United States and gives no hint that the conference did in fact assemble. "We must speak the truth in love," he says, in another connection, "but must nevertheless not hesitate to speak the truth." He does not say, "to speak the whole truth," which in war-time is in some cases obviously inexpedient, but at worst is not always unchristian.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE prospects for a settlement of the fourth civil war that has torn China since the Republic was established seven years ago look fairly bright. Hsu Shih-Chang, who was inaugurated as President at Peking on October 11, not only is an advocate of unity but is said to be acceptable to both factions. There is another favorable sign. Prime Minister Tuan Chi-Jui, who held the reins in President Feng's administration and was the backbone of the Northern militarists, has resigned, and the powerful Anfu Club, made up, according to report, of his henchmen, has decided not to support him for the Vice-Presidency. The failure, after three attempts, to fill this office leaves the way open for a compromise settlement on the basis of a northern President, a southern Vice-President, the dissolution of the rival parliaments at Peking and Canton, and fresh elections. Wu-Ting-Fang, former ambassador to the United States, who has thrown in his lot with the "Constitutionalist" South, is supposed to favor some such arrangement. The "original" parliament, forcibly dissolved and obliged to leave Peking on June 12, 1917, which succeeded in assembling a quorum in Canton last August, passed a resolution protesting the illegality of the "new" parliament at Peking by which Hsu Shih-Chang has been elected, and was reported to have issued a formal declaration of war against Hsu for having accepted election from "a bogus parliament." This was contradicted three days later, however. Meanwhile President Hsu seems to have made a good impression with a circular letter to the provinces calling for progress in providing China with a constitution, and for internal reform, above all in the matter of finances. Another step towards reconciliation was the pardon of General Chang-Hsun, who was concerned in the ten days' restoration of the boy Emperor in 1917. Hostilities are reported to have ceased and the Southern leaders have sent delegates to a conference with President Hsu; its deliberations are said to be making satisfactory progress.

MEANWHILE, so far as is publicly known, the Allies and the United States, for whose helpful mediation there has been much demand among foreign residents in China, "keep on saying nothing." In the middle of September it was reported that joint mediation by Great Britain and the United States had been proffered through Sir John Jordan, the British Ambassador, but on September 25 Secretary Lansing categorically denied that such a step had ever been contemplated. President Wilson's Liberty Loan speech was interpreted in China as a forerunner of American action on China's behalf. Allied assistance towards giving her adequate representation at the Peace Conference is also greatly desired. The Canton authorities have repudiated their reported intention of taking over the Canton customs by force—a proposal which horrified the Legations and led them to talk of blockading Canton and of taking the part of the North against the South. Quite recently Mr. Wang Cheng-Ting has come to Washington on behalf of the Canton authorities; he may be able to help find a solution of China's crisis which will be favorable to the future of that great and unhappy people.

IN view of the fact that the coming Congress will be America's law-making body during the crucial time of world readjustment after the war, the Woman's International League of New York has asked all the Congressional candidates throughout the State how they stand on four of the fourteen points of President Wilson's programme. In general the questions of the women have been courteously received, but Congressman Caldwell, running on a fusion ticket in Queens, feels sure enough of election to defy his questioners. The four points covered by fifteen specific questions are these: a federation of nations, secret diplomacy, competition in armaments, and removal of economic barriers. The replies thus far received, the League reports, indicate that while the President's policies command wide support, especially among his own party, the leader is still a long way ahead of his followers. The part of the programme that sticks hardest in the throats of the politicians is the removal of economic barriers. Most of the would-be Congressmen look forward to a keen fight for the markets of the world against all comers, and therefore many of the candidates—especially, of course, the Republicans—refuse to commit themselves in favor of abolishing our protective tariff and preferential commercial agreements, withdrawing government support of private investments abroad, and opposing American participation in an economic war after the war.

SENATOR Christie Benet writes us in protest against our speaking in our issue of October 5 of his "having played traitor" at the time of the suffrage collapse in the Senate. We based our comment upon the press statement that he had changed just before the vote from the pro-suffrage to the anti-suffrage side: he tells us that he has always been opposed. We would not, of course, do him the slightest injustice, and we have all possible respect for a man who sticks to conscientious beliefs through thick and thin, but we find it very hard not to characterize any one who makes impossible the extension of suffrage to women at this time as a traitor to the cause of democracy. We need not rehearse the arguments set forth by Mr. Wilson. Even if we disregard altogether his appeal for the Amendment as a necessary war-time measure, we would again point out that we are lagging behind all our English-speaking allies in this matter. It was only last week that the House of Commons by a vote of 274 to 25 passed Herbert Samuel's motion "that in the opinion of this House it is desirable that a bill should be passed making women eligible as members of Parliament." This is the prompt reply of Parliament to a recent stupid ruling of the law authorities of the Crown that, despite the enfranchisement of women, they are not eligible to seats in the House. We have not needed legislation to permit Miss Rankin to take her seat, but our parliament refuses to enfranchise American women. How Senator Benet can persist in his position we find it difficult to understand.

THE news from Germany that there is henceforth to be a responsible Ministry in the Reichstag will make many Americans feel a keen sense of envy. We may not come to that for a long while, if ever, but certainly one of the reforms which ought to be achieved in the extension of our own democracy at the close of the war is the seating of our Cabinet in the House. In regard to the censoring of the press, for example, what an enormous benefit it would be to have Postmaster General Burleson reporting daily to the House and submitting himself to questioning from both sides as to his control of newspapers! The only thing that usually keeps an official of his type in order to-day is fear of the press. In England there is added to this control

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the heckling of the Opposition Bench. Every Cabinet Minister knows that his slightest act may be questioned and he himself put to his trumps. We recall Viscount Bryce's being asked on one occasion why he, as Irish Secretary, kept sixteen of the Royal Irish Constabulary on the Widow Mooney's farm, and whether five would not do as well. It seemed absurd enough, yet the principle behind it was vital. Such an arrangement would do more to open up democracy and diplomacy in this country than almost anything that we could think of. No inefficient Cabinet officer could conceal his inefficiency by hiding behind his desk. If the German reforms do not include a question hour for the Ministry it will be a grave mistake.

REPORTS of the legal fight over the Bisbee deportations of July, 1917, show that the Loyalty League has lost in the first stage of the proceedings. This organization appears to have been in the forefront of the citizenry which seized several hundred workmen who were on strike in the copper-mining district, herded them in box cars, and sent them westward over the Santa Fé railway. The League's employment bureau, which tested a worker's patriotism by his attitude towards trade unionism, has been suspended by the Federal authorities, and the judge of the Supreme Court has ruled against a motion to quash the indictments on a very flimsy technicality. An interesting development in the case occurred last week when all the members of the County Bar Association offered their services gratis in behalf of the defendants, passing formal resolutions on the subject to the effect that the I. W. W. is "thoroughly disloyal and hostile" and guilty of "lending aid to the wicked and relentless German autocracy." They say further that the deportation took place with "the consent and sanction and approval of the body politic of this county, protecting from intimidation loyal and law-abiding organized union men in their employment." The newspapers of Arizona, too, are doing what they can to create circumstances favorable to the mobbers and to preserve the miserable fiction of disloyalty and a treasonable common interest with the I. W. W. on the part of the strikers and deported workmen.

AT last there seems to be awakening a sense of shame in the Northwest at the crimes against individuals in the name of loyalty. Thus, Governor Burnquist, who is having to fight hard for reëlection, has offered a reward of $500 for the arrest and conviction of so-called "Knights of Liberty" who perpetrated outrages upon residents of Duluth, resulting in the suicide of one of them, a Swede, These two men were taken from their houses and tarred and feathered merely because they were *suspected* of disloyalty. Though Governor Burnquist has heretofore complacently beheld similar outrages of all sorts and been perfectly content to have the right of free assemblage and free press denied in his State, the administration of which has been practically turned over to a lawless Council of Defence, this last crime is too much for him. Yet the reward he offers is absurd; $10,000 would not have been too much to check the attempt to create a northern Ku-Klux. In ordinary times such happenings would certainly make impossible the reëlection of Governor Burnquist. How it will affect his candidacy will be one of the most interesting of the many questions that will be answered at the polls on next Tuesday.

THE problem of retail coal distribution in the cities appears to be obstinate. In New York, for instance, the outlook for the Bronx is at present rather gloomy, the estimate of dealers being that the district will go short of minimum requirements somewhat more than half a million tons; and reports from other cities show that they are laboring under much the same difficulties in insuring domestic consumers even a slender supply for the winter. The Retail Coal Merchants' Association has sent out a circular to householders urging all possible economy, and specifically asking that no coal be burned in stoves or furnaces before November 1. With all due allowance for nervousness and pessimism and all consideration for any commercial interest that may be enhanced by promoting a scare, there seems only too good reason for believing that there will be great scarcity and suffering this winter. The difficulty is of course not wholly with distribution. We have seen as yet no evidence whatever contrary to our prediction made some weeks ago of a disastrous shortage at the source of supply; and against this, if it comes to pass, hardly any emergency measures can be devised. It is true that Mr. Garfield has issued an encouraging report on coal production, but, in view of the past year's record, we cannot get ourselves into any great state of hopefulness on the strength of his assurance. Last winter the Socialist members of the Board of Aldermen in New York proposed the purchase through the Mayor's Purchasing Committee of a large amount of coal for sale at cost in quantities of one ton or less, and presented a carefully elaborated plan for storage, selling and delivery. It might be reconsidered to advantage in the next two months—if, indeed, enough coal can be had to make the attempt worth while—and other cities also might get assistance by studying it.

THERE are four hundred vacancies on the staff of the New York public schools, and, according to all reports, the schools in other parts of the country are depleted proportionately—or worse. Never in Connecticut's history were the schools so poorly off for teachers, and the fall opening in Pennsylvania and New Jersey is very discouraging. The trouble, as we have pointed out before, is primarily with the shrinkage in the purchasing power of money, which always bears hardest on those of fixed income, and is felt first and most acutely by those whose fixed income is set at the margin of decent subsistence, like teachers and clergymen. It is impossible for teachers to face a continuance of costly living conditions at their present rate of pay; and how to better salaries and reconcile the taxpayers is the question that local boards find hard to solve. Meanwhile, many attractive and unusual opportunities have been opened in commerce and trade for precisely the type of person who has hitherto gravitated into teaching. Many male teachers have gone into the army, and others into various kinds of war work; while large numbers of women have heeded the call from offices which promise them congenial employment the year round at double the teacher's weekly rate of wage, or better, and a vacation with pay. No one can complain of this tendency, for it seems really to be a matter of self-defence upon the part of the teachers. Yet, after the great struggle to raise the standards of school-teaching to even comparative excellence, it would seem impossible to let them decline. The taxpayer must be made to perceive the quality of the emergency.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The German Collapse

WHEN was there ever a more abject surrender than is contained in Austria's appeal for peace sent to the President on October 28? The Dual Monarchy is so eager to end its part in the war that it avows its readiness to enter into separate negotiations "without awaiting the result of other negotiations," thus abandoning its powerful partner in the wicked enterprise for which the crime of Sarajevo was the excuse. Now after four years the nation which was going to terminate the Servian lawlessness for its own imperialistic purposes implores Mr. Wilson to be so good as to see that it obtains an armistice at once on all the fronts. The German house of cards is collapsing before our eyes with a speed and a completeness which appear incredible if one looks back as far as July. Turkey is also about to surrender, and there is doubtless much more going on behind the scenes than we are allowed to know. As for Germany herself, her brief rejoinder to the President's last note shows that her new leaders are merely waiting to know how stiff the dose the Allies will prescribe as prerequisite to an armistice. The fact of her defeat is accepted on every hand in Berlin and is being discussed openly and freely. As the *Frankfurter Zeitung* announced days ago "our coming abandonment by the Austrians," it is plain that Berlin knew of the impending collapse of the Austro-Hungarians well in advance. When to this is added the dismissal of Ludendorff it is plain that everything is being jettisoned. Certainly no one can now deny, after Ludendorff's "resignation" and the Reichstag's vote that all matters military must henceforth be subordinated to civilian authority, that the wish of the President and of the whole world for a change of rulers in Berlin is at this moment being fulfilled.

The end of the war is in sight; it is almost time for the *Te Deums*, since Germany without Austria and Turkey can no longer go on. The merited *débâcle* is at hand. The Kaiser's Germany is face to face with complete humiliation such as it has not known since the days of Napoleon. The other and nobler Germany, blinded as it has been by the spell of patriotism, misled, supinely approving by silence such abominations as the sinking of the Lusitania, is asserting itself at last. With Ludendorff gone and Hindenburg likely to follow, the final rout of the Junkers, the militarists, the advocates of the policy of blood and iron, the schemers for a Germanized *Mitteleuropa*, the perpetrators of the Brest-Litovsk infamy, appears simply a question of days. No doubter can say that the resignation of Ludendorff is merely camouflage; no one who has known the Prussian military caste as it was prior to the war can feel otherwise than that his dismissal and the Reichstag vote spell the overturn of the system which has been responsible for the corruption and brutalization of modern Germany. No wonder that the Kaiser is reported to be planning to be hereditary president of the German Republic!

Additional light is afforded by a remarkable editorial by Theodor Wolff in the *Berliner Tageblatt*. He declares that Ludendorff, who has "for two years been ruling Germany like a dictator with a domineering personality and the desire to have a finger in every pie," first favored the armistice but afterwards changed his mind because he objected to the constitutional changes involving the subordination of the military to the civil authorities. Hindenburg himself telegraphed to a press conference on October 25 that the army rejected President Wilson's demands for capitulation. That the civilian authorities and the public should then have been able to reject the army's and Hindenburg's views of what should be done, when the foe is at the gates, is again an almost miraculous happening, and clear proof that there is revolution in Germany. Just what has brought about this condition in Berlin, just what has made Austria go down on her knees to beg for peace and has made Kaiser Karl ready to fall in with the President's insistence that the new-born Czecho-Slovak "nation," without a home, or boundary, or government, shall now decide the future of the Dual Monarchy, is the great riddle of the hour. The American and Allied troops are still too far from the Rhine to attribute the situation entirely to our military successes. Possibly it will appear that it is the blockade which, like the Federal blockade of the Confederacy, deserves the chief credit. Perhaps that sheer war-weariness to which France so nearly yielded in 1917 is responsible; perhaps the bloodshed could no longer be endured; perhaps the collapse is due to a realization of the economic and financial exhaustion close at hand, with the spirit of revolution overshadowing all. Time alone will explain, but to-day, we repeat, the war rapidly nears its end, the crimes against Servia and Belgium, against humanity upon sea and land, are in process of being expiated.

Under these circumstances it is plainly no longer worth while to discuss at length the President's last note. The discouraging effects that we feared last week cannot come to pass with enemies ready for peace at any price. But even now it is time to point out that what we see ending is only the first phase; the war will not be won and cannot be won upon the battlefield alone. The great issue as to whether this is to be the last of wars, as so many of our politicians have asserted, will be decided at the peace table. There is before us a more difficult and dangerous battle than any yet fought, and the fact that Germany and Austria are so completely humbled will make the task of all liberals the more difficult. If it is to be a Junker peace, if the essential, underlying principles of the President's fourteen peace terms are not to be accepted, the world will go on in the same old, stupid way—headed, as Mr. Asquith has just said, for destruction. "Nothing," he declared, "is more certain than that, if the competition in armaments is allowed to continue for the lifetime of another generation, the next great war will bring about the practical extinction of civilization and the permanent crippling of the human race." The more is the pity that Mr. Wilson has made the great blunder of allowing his dull and narrow Postmaster General, his narrower Attorney General, and all the other agencies under his control, to suppress adequate discussion of the war and of peace aims. A blind subordination to the patriotic mania that we should stand by the President and trust all to him is likely to cost us dear. At the very moment of his extremest trial our liberal forces are by his own act scattered, silenced, disorganized, some in prison. If he loses his great fight for humanity it will be because he was deliberately silent when freedom of speech and the right of conscience were struck down in America. All the more reason that liberals should rally now to see that for the sake of all humanity he shall not lose the fight if it is possible to achieve victory. It is a time to overlook his errors of judgment and policy and to pull together that the new world order may come into existence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Woodrow Wilson, Politician

PRESIDENT WILSON has played a dangerous game, and played it badly. No one will deny his right to appeal to the American people to support him, if at any time he thinks that such an appeal is necessary. But the kind of appeal which he made on October 24 is not the sort of statement which he should have issued, nor is it one which the American public will accept without misgiving. Instead of asking the voters to scrutinize his acts as President, to approve them if they feel so inclined, and to register their approval by voting for Congressional candidates who, in their judgment, will best help him to carry his policies through to the end, he puts the whole appeal upon an avowedly partisan basis. The support which he asks is indeed a support for himself as President, but it is as head of the Democratic party rather than as President of the whole Republic that he begs for a favorable verdict. He admits that the Republican minority in Congress has "unquestionably been pro-war," but it has also been "anti-Administration"; and for the latter there is no forgiveness. It is not enough, in Mr. Wilson's view, to be a patriot, or to stand for the war with all one's might; it is necessary also to be a Democrat if patriotism is to be counted for righteousness.

The grounds upon which Mr. Wilson bases his appeal will not bear examination. It is "imperatively necessary," he declares, "that the nation should give its undivided support to the Government under a unified leadership," and a Republican Congress "would divide the leadership." This is a characteristic juggling with words. The question of national policy is not exclusively a Presidential matter; both the Congress and the people have a rightful voice in the determination of the course which the nation should pursue. The President is certainly expected to say what he wants, but he has no mandate to insist that everybody shall agree with him and support him, or to give his own programme the exclusive right of way. The kind of "unified leadership" for which Mr. Wilson appeals is one which admits of no debate, and in which the weighing of evidence and the discussion of opposing arguments find no place. It is nothing less than autocracy for the President to claim a right to decide what is and what is not the best course for the nation to follow, and to demand unhesitating acquiescence in his decision. If such is to be the theory of Presidential power, there will be in practice no place for a legislature at all, save as a rubber stamp which shall give the necessary legal form to what the President does.

The promptness with which the Republican leaders have taken up the challenge is one of the most hopeful signs of political health which the country has witnessed for many a day. So far as the Republican programme has been revealed, we are suspicious of it, but it nevertheless is well that the party does not propose to knuckle under or allow Mr. Wilson to brand it as a party of obstruction without a vigorous rejoinder. Whether or not the issue will redound to the advantage of the Republicans by enabling them to win seats in the Senate or House which are now held by Democrats is doubtful. The election is close at hand, and there is hardly time for an elaborate discussion of Mr. Wilson's policy such as would ordinarily be required to affect doubtful votes. Mr. Wilson is likely, we think, to hold a majority in the next Congress; and a Democratic majority, even if reduced in size, will still make possible the "unified leadership" which the President has declared necessary.

Whether the next Congress has a Democratic majority or not, however, the President's prestige will have been dimmed. What Mr. Wilson has done, quite unwittingly we may be sure, is to dispel some of the halo which has long attended him as President. From a time when half the country was against him, Mr. Wilson passed by rapid stages to a time when the whole country seemed to be for him; and in the process he became, in the popular imagination, something more than a man. His skilfully-phrased messages and addresses, with their insistence upon the ethical aspects of national and international questions, seemed to many the final word of political wisdom. Mr. Wilson caught the imagination of the American people, and had only to speak to be obeyed. Now, however, the golden haze has largely vanished and the politician stands revealed. The "unified leadership" for which he pleads is the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, and of the Democratic party which he absolutely controls. The policies for which he demands support, and for alleged opposition to which he now tries to read the Republicans out of court, are the policies of Mr. Wilson himself and his handful of unofficial advisers. It is his own uncontrolled will which he insists shall now prevail.

Cold, self-centred and calculating as such a leadership must always be, it might be accepted with entire confidence, especially in such troubled times as these, if the policies which Mr. Wilson so frequently advocates were more clearly stated and more openly pursued. As a matter of fact, there is still a great deal of vagueness about the kind of peace which Mr. Wilson aims to secure. The much-discussed "fourteen points," even if the highly controversial doctrines which some of them embody be disregarded, are of course far from being a complete statement of peace terms; moreover, they now need revision and clear definition. Even if Mr. Wilson himself had not twice sought to explain them, thereby adding eight more "points" to the original fourteen, his programme of peace must have been materially altered by the course of events in Russia and the recognition of the Czecho-Slovaks and the Jugoslavs. What can be said for Mr. Wilson's various "points" is that they lay down certain principles which a peace settlement ought to embody, at the same time that they indicate in a number of specific cases the kind of international adjustment that ought to be made.

It may very possibly turn out that Mr. Wilson, by frankly identifying himself and his policies with the only possible welfare of the nation, has for once builded better than he knew. Whatever else he has accomplished by his bungling appeal to the voters, he has opened the gates of discussion in Congress and in the country, and any attempt to close them hereafter will put both him and his party in jeopardy. Men who have been hypnotized or overawed by our improper Espionage Act or the appeal of blind patriotism will henceforth be free to speak their minds, for the magic of a name will no longer make the public afraid. The Republicans now have an issue of which we may be sure they will make effective use. There is only one course which, under these new circumstances, will retain for Mr. Wilson the leadership in ideas which he has hitherto enjoyed, and that is to drop the discredited rôle of political autocrat, abandon the secrecy and aloofness which have been his bane, take Congress and the public into his confidence, and play the game of world statesmanship in the open. If he will do this, his mistakes as a politician will be forgiven and forgotten.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Ferocious Sentences

ON Friday last three men and one woman, Russian by birth, were given sentences aggregating two hundred and eighty-five years in the United States District Court in New York. The accusation against them was that they had interfered with the draft (!) by circulating literature attacking this Government's intervention in Russia. One of their leaflets is in our possession. Nine-tenths of it seems to us entirely legitimate criticism; the rest is an appeal for class revolution along the familiar lines which in peace would ripple no waters. On the stand they called themselves anarchists, and so they go to jail for periods of fifteen and twenty years, their several sentences running concurrently. They will be taken not to a reformatory, but to one of our prisons, which, despite progress towards reform, remain a disgrace to our civilization. They will neither be reasoned with nor educated to a saner and wiser view of life—and they plainly are badly in need of education. Upon them will not be placed that responsibility for the government in prison of themselves or their fellow-convicts which Mr. Osborne has demonstrated to be one of the surest ways of taming criminals and of restoring them to useful citizenship. They will be discharged either as hardened criminals or as more dangerous and bitter enemies of the existing order than when they went into prison. And this is the process we in 1918 call safeguarding society and "keeping Bolshevism out of America"! As for the words of the United States Court which sentenced these anarchists, such a total lack of dignity and judicial poise we have seldom encountered. "An aggravated case of literary indigestion"; —"I am not going to let you make a soap-box oration, Mollie";—"All they have raised is hell";—"The flowers that bloom in the spring, trala" (three times at one session)—these are phrases attributed by the New York newspapers to the judge. His address in delivering sentence was a stump speech with quotations from Shakespeare; it "referred to his experiences as District Attorney and Judge in Alabama and as Representative in Congress." Coming from a United States judge this is profoundly humiliating, and is bound to create the impression that justice has not been done to these misguided wrong-doers.

But these sentences are merely examples of many that are being imposed by our courts every day. One of the very finest young college graduates we have known has just been sentenced to twenty-five years in prison for refusing to take human life at the behest of the State, and one of the ablest and most useful young graduates of Harvard faces a similar sentence. In the former case a college-mate who sat upon the court-martial is reported to have favored the death penalty for this conscientious objector to war. All objectors now tried are receiving sentences ranging from fifteen to thirty-five years, whereas the corresponding sentences in England are two years. The day before the anarchists were sentenced a man was condemned to six months in a workhouse for saying that he preferred the Kaiser and Bismarck to Wilson, and similar sentences were imposed upon three persons for singing the Watch on the Rhine at one a.m. on their way home from a saloon, upon a man who shouted "Hurrah for the Kaiser!" and upon another who declared that the Kaiser would win the war. For saying that he "hoped the Government would go to hell" a citizen of Lansing was given twenty years in prison and fined $10,000, although it was shown that he spoke in a moment of anger, after having been compelled by force to buy Liberty bonds.

These sentences contrast amazingly with those imposed in Europe. For distributing pamphlets calling for revolution and the overthrow of the German Empire—that is, doing just what our New York anarchists did—twelve members of the German Independent Socialists were convicted of high treason and sentenced to penal servitude for terms varying from eighteen months to eight years. Liebknecht, who is the hero of Berlin since his pardon, was sentenced for only four years for attempted high treason. Our American rage against those who disagree with us would permit of no such sentence or such leniency; it is hardly possible to think of Debs being pardoned as Liebknecht has been. Even in Russia some would-be regicides caught red-handed were given sentences ranging only up to eight years. We confess that we cannot understand why a democracy hitherto rated as the most liberal and best-educated can suddenly believe that a state of mind can be altered by inflicting ferocious punishments upon those who confess to believing things radical, or foolish, or wicked.

But aside from foreign practice, history has proved nothing more completely than that proscribing people who are opposed to what you believe is the one certain way to advance their cause. All the horrors of Siberia did not avail to secure the dynasty of the Romanovs, any more than the tortures of the Inquisition were successful in checking the spread of Protestantism. All the terrors inflicted by the wicked Emperor Franz Josef in Italy prior to its redemption—the same wicked old man who started the world war—served not at all to keep Italy for Austria. Should Judge Clayton read Thayer's "Cavour" he would learn a great deal about long sentences. We commend to him the story of the nine men who were executed in Mantua, and of the seventy who were imprisoned for lesser terms than Judge Clayton gave to the poor wretches who came before him. Austria, writes Mr. Thayer, had unmistakably the right to uproot the leaders of the conspiracy against her government, "but posterity condemns Austria for the way in which she did it." By punishing with the barbarity which she employed, he declares, "she heaped up against herself an immense store of hatred, which sooner or later would seek revenge."

If this Italian record does not move Judge Clayton, let him turn to Ireland. Where could there be clearer proof of the stupidity of long sentences to cure men's states of mind? It was only the other day that dozens of Irishmen were being shot. Hundreds are sentenced every day by Irish Claytons to long terms. What has happened? Let a New Zealand editor, Mr. Geddis, tell. A guest of the British Government, he met many Sinn Feiners. "He [the Sinn Feiner] now wants," Mr. Geddis declares, "a *separate republic*. He wants a destiny apart from England." The moral is obvious. Men are to be won to policies and governments not by force or by twenty years in jail, but by capturing their confidence and their esteem. Is there not a warning in this for the land of the free and the home of the brave? Or must we be written down as being so fearful for the righteousness of our cause in this war, and for the safety of our republican institutions, as to be willing to outdo the monarchies of Europe and the Russia of the Czar in the severity of our penalties for those who transgress?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Demobilization of Industry

IT is too much to expect that the elaborate programme of industrial reconstruction lately put out by the Social Democratic League of America will receive much consideration from either Democrats or Republicans, even if it should prove acceptable to both branches of the Socialist party or to the radical elements in the ranks of organized labor. However socialistic the character of much of our recent labor policy may have been, the American people as a whole are still far from the point of being ready to accept the Socialist philosophy in its entirety. The publication of the programme in question is, however, a political event of importance for the reason that it calls attention, albeit in an uncompromising fashion, to the part which the Government must play in industrial demobilization.

The industrial situation which will exist at the close of hostilities has no parallel in our history. The huge businesses which are engaged in producing war materials of all sorts will be running at full capacity. The sharp line between essential and non-essential industries will still be drawn, and practically every important industry, whether classed as essential or not, will be under more or less complete Government control. The Government will still be directing the operation of railways, telegraphs and telephones, the building of ships, foreign commerce, and the employment of unskilled labor. The Food Administration, the Fuel Administration, the War Labor Board, and a score of other governmental agencies will still be in operation. Thousands of women will be found in employments hitherto regarded as suitable only for men. How is a situation which has developed out of the necessities of war to be dealt with once the war has ceased to be? Shall governmental control be prolonged indefinitely, or shall the old conditions of individual initiative and competition, the old freedom of capital and labor to haggle and quarrel over rights and claims, become once more, eventually if not immediately, the normal condition of American industry?

The case of the great munitions industries affords a striking illustration of the chaos which may result in the labor and business world if the hand of Government is suddenly withdrawn. Unless the United States is to go over bodily to the militarists and maintain a huge army and navy as a preparation for future wars, the production of munitions should automatically cease as soon as hostilities are suspended. What is to be done with the munitions plants and their hundreds of thousands of men and women employees? The obvious course will be to convert such of them as are not worn out into plants for the manufacture of building materials, transportation equipment, and other commodities of which a peaceful world will have need. The extent to which this can be done, however, will depend upon industrial conditions both in this country and in Europe. If Europe, for example, is able to pay for the great quantities of American manufactures which its economic necessities will require, or if an ample market for similar products develops in the United States, the conversion of munitions plants to peace uses will be likely to go on with a minimum of industrial disturbance. If such markets are not found, then any attempt suddenly to cut down production will demoralize industry in all directions, throw thousands of workers out of employment, and precipitate labor troubles of unprecedented magnitude.

What is true of munitions is true, in general, of every other important industry. Briefly stated, the problem of industrial demobilization is how to bring the country back to peace conditions without jeopardizing capital, lowering the value of legitimate investments, upsetting the market for raw materials and manufactures, throwing land and ocean transportation into confusion, forcing violent changes in prices and wages, and causing unemployment on a vast scale. Unquestionably, if such untoward results are to be avoided, it can only be by the gradual withdrawal of governmental control after the peace. The artificially stimulated economic life of the war period must not be unduly prolonged.

Here, manifestly, is an industrial situation to which the Government cannot too soon or too actively give its attention. If it is to the Federal Government that we must look for wise control of the process of transformation, whether in the readjustment of war industries to peace needs, or the regulation of profits and wages, or the proper employment of women in wage-earning occupations, a careful and detailed planning of the steps which must soon be taken ought to be begun without delay. What is always to be remembered, however, is that Government control, however necessary, will be only a menace if it does not aim to bring about ultimately the largest possible measure of economic freedom and coöperation. Merely to take sides with labor against capital, or with capital against labor, or to play the one off against the other, would be only a makeshift. The democratization of industry, which should be one of the solid fruits of the present war, is only to be looked for through the democratization of politics and government.

Raleigh in 1918

NEWS comes from London of a plan to commemorate, there and at Raleigh, North Carolina, the tercentenary just passed of Sir Walter Raleigh's death, October 29, 1618. Professor Gollancz, with former Ambassador Page, originated the scheme, which provides for a special service at St. Margaret's, Westminster, where Raleigh was buried and where there is already a memorial window given by Americans; for a public meeting at the Mansion House at which Mr. Gosse, Mr. Balfour, Lord Bryce, Sir Ian Hamilton, and American representatives were to speak; and for papers to be read at later dates by Professor Firth, Sir Sidney Lee, Sir Harry Stephen, Mr. Lionel Cust, and Professor Gollancz. There is even talk of a "Raleigh House" in London for promoting intellectual coöperation between British and American scholars.

The undertaking serves not only to recall the memory of an extraordinary man, the very mirror and summary of Elizabethan qualities—soldier, admiral, explorer, colonizer, courtier, poet, historian, scientist, free-thinker, and martyr to the Stuarts, who disinterred Edmund Spenser from his Irish obscurity, initiated (it is said) the famous meetings at the Mermaid Tavern, and almost certainly introduced potatoes and tobacco into the British Isles—but also to draw together our hopeful, international time and that other period when Raleigh was aspiring to add a fourth to the three members of the English-speaking world —Virginia. He was nearly the last Britisher who seems neither Europe's man nor America's man. After him came adhesion to one continent or the other, so that Milton

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Cromwell, for all their interest in New England, were thoroughly of the Old, and Wolfe and Chatham and Burke were barely ours. But upon Raleigh, though he never saw Virginia or her sunny capes, England and America may make the same equal claim as upon Shakespeare.

If ever since the days of Raleigh's execution the two nations were to share a hero, it should be now, and a hero of such a type. Raleigh spoke of Spain as a hero would speak now of another enemy: "Who would therefore repose trust in such a nation of ravinous straungers, and especially in those Spaniardes which more greedily thirst after English bloud, then after the lives of anie other people of Europe; for the manie overthrowes and dishonours they have received at our handes, whose weaknesse we have discovered to the world, and whose forces at home, abroad in *Europe*, in *India*, by sea and land; we have . . . overthrowne and dishonoured?" "Thus it hath pleased God to fight for us, and to defend the iustice of our cause, against the ambicious and bloudy pretences of the Spaniard, who seeking to devour all nations, are themselves devoured." Raleigh fought Spaniards with a sword as gay as a troubadour's and as stern as a crusader's, fonder of war as war than our hero would probably be now, but sustained like him with the sense of a high, even a sacred, duty to perform against "their bloudy and iniurious designes, purposed and practised against all Christian Princes, over whom they seeke unlawful and ungodly rule and Empery." And beyond victory he saw peace in new lands won from the wilderness and springing up in new harvests of civilization.

Raleigh as colonizer of course seems more important in the twentieth century than Raleigh as venturer upon any other of his many rôles, and yet his own plans for Virginia fell even farther short of accomplishment than did his "Cynthia" or his "History of the World," or his discovery of Guiana. But of each of these what has survived is the magnanimity of the enterprise, the willingness to undertake the most gigantic task, and the sort of fiery constancy with which he pursued his aims even though by nature he was headlong and variable. Other men had to reach Virginia, others to plant the colony deeply enough to take root, but the glory of the first vision belongs to Raleigh. If now we think he has too much glory for a mere dream we have only to consider the likeness of his hopes to those enormous hopes now filling the world for another victory and a peace beyond it. The mood in which Western Europe faced the rush of enemy armies in 1914 was like that in which England faced the Armada. There were panic and the counsel of terror, but the desperate chivalry of what in both instances had come to seem an older time appeared everywhere. Hope against hope prevailed in the sixteenth century, and is increasingly prevailing in the twentieth. Maurauders so opposed, "seeking to devour all nations, are themselves devoured," said Raleigh exultantly. This proud confidence, however, stirs the imagination less than his great prophecy of Virginia, "I shall yet live to see it an Inglishe nation," less than the terms of his commission for Sir Humphrey Gilbert "to inhabit and possess all Heathen lands not in the possession of any Christian prince." If Raleigh's vision bore such fruit as North America, surely no one need lose faith in the new wild vision of our generation. It is a vision of new nations won for the permanent companionship of peace. That alone can repay the bitter voyage of these past four years, over seas more stormy than Raleigh ever met on the Atlantic.

Monuments, Up and Down

RAPPROCHEMENT there may be between Berlin and Petrograd, as our official press mentor would have it, but just at present the two capitals do not seem to be pulling together quite as Mr. Creel would like—at least in things artistic. Thus, there is a distinct divergence in the matter of statues. The savage, bloodthirsty Bolsheviki depicted by the New York *Times* and the London *Daily Mail* are just now bent, not on tearing everything down, but on putting some things up. In Moscow alone they are erecting sixty-three statues, as if to show that they, at times, can be "constructive." And what subjects they choose—men like Tolstoy the non-resistant, Pushkin, Dostoyevsky, Bakunin, Metchnikoff, Mendelyev, Lermontov, and twenty-four other Russian authors, political leaders, and scientists, without a general or an admiral on the list! An untutored lot these Bolsheviki, sadly lacking in good taste and knowledge of the worth-while things of life. They have gone out of their way, too, to honor twenty-four foreigners, including Marx, Engels, Bebel and Jaurès, Tiberius Gracchus, Robespierre, Marat, and Danton—as if men like Lenine and Trotzky could have read history!

Now in Germany they are taking statues down—a war necessity, of course. But in the Fatherland the military authorities are wisely sacrificing the statues of mere sculptors, artists, poets, and authors, and, as the perverse *Rhenische Zeitung* insists, carefully preserving those of every soldier and Hohenzollern. Naturally, a Minister of State replies to this vicious newspaper in a speech in the Reichstag; yet the editor stands his ground and asks everybody interested to see for himself just what is happening in Cologne. The rebellious city fathers there have protested against the taking down of three monuments to well-known *bourgeois*, while several Hohenzollerns still ride their fat bronze horses.

In Bavaria no less than three hundred monuments have been turned over to the military, of which one hundred and forty are in Munich. Many of them are slated for replacement after the war, but others are gone forever. All belong to the period since 1850. Here we have German efficiency again; the Germans are making a virtue of necessity and clearing away some sculptural rubbish, even if they are discriminating in favor of the ruling classes. The Munich statues of Schiller and Goethe are to be replaced, and so are those of King Max and Ludwig the Second. The great "Bavaria" is spared, but the "Germania" in the Sophienstrasse and the two horsemen before the Akademie are to disappear for all time. If only the process could be applied to the terrible Siegesallee in the Tiergarten in Berlin the war might yet wear a brighter aspect for the half-starved Berliners.

As for ourselves, we should like to be general in command of New York, Boston and Philadelphia for about two weeks. We would sacrifice sculptured generals, poets, artists, and Shakespeare, too, without fear or favor. We should begin with the Mall in Central Park, regardless of the material of the statues, and then wipe off the earth the unforgivable Hearst monument to the Maine and the hideous Pulitzer-Hastings fountain that spoils the noble entrance at Fifth Avenue. For two weeks we should revel in militarism and riot in destroying bronze horrors. For this privilege one might even turn bitter-ender.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Politics in Montana

By LOUIS LEVINE

OLD party lines are breaking down in the Northwest, and new issues are coming to the front. The elections to be held on November 5 accordingly possess unusual interest. Three influences promised to make the campaign in Montana exciting as well as significant. First, the Non-Partisan League was to enter Montana politics for the first time. Second, the workers in Butte, exasperated by the losing of several bitter strikes, promised to support the League. These two organizations embodied the accumulated feeling of resentment against the alleged domination of State politics by the Anaconda Copper Mining Company, and represented the organized demand for political and economic reform. The third influence was a curious complex of personal, State, and national issues represented by Miss Jeannette Rankin, who early in the spring announced her candidacy for the United States Senate.

The primaries, held on August 29, shattered some of these great expectations. The accusation of disloyalty persistently circulated by the press of the State against the League evidently had its effect. In addition, the League divided its forces, its members entering the primaries of both parties in an effort to influence both. They succeeded in nominating fourteen State Senators and about forty candidates for the lower house, but they lost the chance of repeating their success in North Dakota and Idaho by capturing the machinery of one of the political parties.

It is likely that the Non-Partisan League will have from thirty to forty members in the lower house of the State Legislature, that is, about one third. In that case, it will have an opportunity to balance the other parties against each other and probably to bargain for some of its demands. The Non-Partisans will undoubtedly make an attack on the system of mine taxation and on the workmen's compensation law, which involves chiefly the Anaconda Copper Mining Company. The workers will most probably have a strong advocate of their interests in W. F. Dunn, whose candidacy on the Democratic ticket in Silver Bow County is a curious and amusing illustration of the primary system. Though Silver Bow County has always been regarded as a citadel of the Democratic party and of the mining interests, the radical workers of Butte have succeeded in nominating Mr. Dunn, who is one of the leaders of the radical labor forces in Butte and one of the editors of their paper, the *Butte Daily Bulletin*. He was recently arrested, it is said, for having questioned the authority of the State Council of Defence. He is now out on bail and fills his paper with violent diatribes against the "Copper Trust" and the whole capitalistic system. Yet he is running on the same ticket with D. M. Kelly, attorney for the Anaconda Copper Mining Company, notorious for his bitter denunciation of Dunn and his followers.

The combination of workers and farmers will unquestionably represent a new departure in Montana state politics. More doubtful is the fate of Miss Jeannette Rankin. Two years ago Miss Rankin was elected by the women, who were stirred by the vision of a woman in Congress, but they are not in the least interested in sending the first woman to the United States Senate. Other sentiments are more powerful. Miss Rankin voted against the declaration of war. That is used effectively against her. But the real cause of the bitter opposition to her on the part of those whose views are voiced by the *Butte Miner*, the *Anaconda Standard*, the *Helena Independent*, and similar newspapers, is her economic radicalism. Nominally a Republican, Miss Rankin has championed the cause of the workers of Montana and has attacked the mining companies of the State. She is the author of a bill for Federal ownership and control of mines. In the summer of 1917, she openly defended the striking miners. The *Butte Miner* falsely brands her as a "rabid Socialist of the I. W. W. type."

The decision to run for the Senate was forced upon Miss Rankin by the action of the last State Legislature in districting the State for Congressional elections. As a result, Miss Rankin found herself in the western district of the State, a Republican in a Democratic stronghold. Her advisers decided that she had a better chance running for the Senate at large than trying for reëlection to the House in her own district. In view of the solid opposition of the business interests of the State, she had to join hands with the Non-Partisan League and the radical workers. In the Republican primary Miss Rankin received 17,091 votes against the 18,805 of Dr. Oscar M. Lanstrum of Helena, who is now the Republican candidate for the Senate against Thomas J. Walsh, the candidate for reëlection on the Democratic ticket. Miss Rankin would have been out of the race, had not the National party, which made its appearance in the State last spring and gathered into its fold a little band of disappointed Socialists and forlorn Progressives, come to her rescue. I am told that one hundred and thirty votes were cast for Miss Rankin by members of the National party who wrote in her name on the ballot. For a while the National party seemed destined to supply color and zest to the campaign. Even the *Butte Miner* admitted that it was "uneasy" over Miss Rankin's candidacy, fearing the combined vote of the Non-Partisans and the workers.

Ever since Frank Little's body was found dangling outside the city limits of Butte, over a year ago, the newspapers of the State, led by the *Daily Missoulian*, have been carrying on a violent campaign against the United States district attorney, B. K. Wheeler, who has been accused of slackness in prosecuting cases of sedition and especially of sympathy with the radical workers. He is listed by the newspapers of the State as an I. W. W., a Socialist, and a man who hobnobs with the "Bolsheviks." Last spring his term expired and his renomination was recommended by Senator Walsh, but was delayed in view of Senator Myer's opposition. A few weeks ago Mr. Wheeler, after a visit to Washington, announced his resignation in order not to embarrass Senator Walsh. This action has solidified the Democratic party in support of Senator Walsh, but may cost the Senator a good many votes, which will go to Miss Rankin.

The National party also succeeded in placing on the ballot Mr. Kane as candidate for Congress. Mr. Kane is a State Senator, and in the session of 1917 was chairman of the Senate Tax Investigation Committee which recommended heavier taxes on the mining companies. He has since withdrawn from the race, however, leaving the field to the Republican candidate, who is contesting the reëlection of Congressman Evans.

Regardless of all these complications, excitement is lacking. Politics is evidently adjourned. At first it was agreed to postpone the campaign for the duration of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberty Loan drive. Then came the Spanish influenza, and all gatherings were forbidden throughout the State by the boards of health. Congressman Evans is in Washington at his desk. Dr. Lanstrum has been commandeered by the State Board of Health to fight the influenza. For a while Miss Rankin followed her lonely trail in the eastern part of the State. But she has been compelled to desist while the epidemic lasts.

It is almost certain that Senator Walsh will be reëlected. The Republicans realize that they have no issue. The recognized Republican papers of the State are harping on one theme, that America needs a "stonewall tariff" to protect her industries from German competition after the war, and that "the Democrats cannot be trusted to frame a real protective tariff." In questions of State politics, the Republicans can hardly be differentiated from the Democrats. Both parties have declared their readiness to fight the I. W. W. and the Non-Partisan League and have in a general way promised improvements in matters of workmen's compensation and taxation.

Whatever the outcome of the election, the political trend will remain the same. The situation in Montana, as in many other States, reveals the dualism of the Democratic party as standard-bearer of national and State policies. It also shows that if the urgent issues of political and economic reform in the State are to be squarely met, a new political alignment based on economic considerations, is inevitable. That the process has begun in Montana is clear. That it will have a profound effect on national politics in the near future, will become clear before long.

Napoleon and Hohenzollern

By WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE

JUST one hundred years before the outbreak of the present war Napoleon abdicated at Fontainebleau and was transported to Elba. The following year he returned to France. His rule of a hundred days ended at Waterloo and he was imprisoned at St. Helena. In 1816 the Metternich system of interventions to suppress liberalism went into operation and the first modern league of nations, under the name of the Holy Alliance, began its sorry career. The following year, 1817, occurred the suppression, by military force, of a liberal assembly of protest, the "Blanket Meeting," at Manchester, England. In 1818 the first of the Metternich congresses was held at Aix la Chapelle, and the armies of the Allies evacuated French territory. The reign of Bourbon absolutism began again.

Within the period of one generation, 1789-1818, liberalism had flooded Europe, terrorized the political system imposed by Louis XIV, sowed the seeds of freedom, been seduced into outrage by its own prophets, curbed by its own armies under Bonaparte, crushed by an imperial militarism under Napoleon the Emperor, and apparently extinguished by something absolutely new, the irrepressible sense of nationality. The battle of Leipzig is properly styled the battle of the nations. It was Spain which first discovered modern nationality and began the rout of an imperialism seeking to force the same institutions on all peoples. The dangers of standing armies and a military caste were well understood, but popular nationality braved them in the support of what swiftly turned from an ideal into an idol.

The conditions antecedent to Napoleon's first abdication bear some resemblance to those now existing. There is the same collapse of military imperialism, there is an even more deep-seated and widespread passion for nationality, defined in such terms and bedecked in such a way that it is now a dangerous fetich. There was, too, a Concert of Allied Powers with a certain unity of military command, and one outstanding personage permitted to dominate the political situation. There is some resemblance between Wellington associated with Alexander I and Foch smashing the foe in advance of Wilson. There was also a resemblance in the despairing effort of dynasties to retain some tatters of monarchical raiment; the same grim determination of radicals to socialize the world, destroy all obstacles to fraternity and inaugurate a peace millenium. The success of dynastic politics at the Congress of Vienna was due to certain sops thrown to the Cerberus of nationality. National honor was a catchword then as now. There was the same hysteria and the same hurling of opprobrious epithets; the same frenzy of hate; the same horror of atrocity and outrage; the same demand for retaliatory justice.

There was no element of choice in Napoleon's abdication at Fontainebleau in 1814. The Allies were not only in Paris, they occupied with their forces the key districts of France. To-day there is no hostile sentry in Berlin, no occupation of German soil by a foe. That last campaign of Napoleon's had been his one moral victory because, as the majority of the plain French folk had come at last to believe, he had lost all in defence of their soil with its former frontiers, and this notion sank permanently into the national soul, as was proved not only the following year but after the lapse of a generation; nor has it even now entirely disappeared, since his countrymen glory in the conviction that Foch's strategy is an adaptation of Napoleonic principles. The rank and file of the army at Fontainebleau desired to retreat behind the Emperor for another stand on the Loire. Not so his marshals and great Ministers of State, all of whom were glutted with wealth acquired by his aid and longed for peace that they might spend their great incomes in self-indulgent leisure. Marmont, his favorite, had already deserted him; and his own creatures, military and civil, compelled the fateful signature. To the demand imposed by crushing defeat, by the desertion of his lieutenants, and by the yearning of the nation for rest he necessarily yielded, trusting, however, that his act would result in the regency of Marie Louise for her son and his.

In any effort to draw lessons from history by instituting parallels it must be remembered that resemblance is more alluring than contrast. Napoleon's early genius displayed incomparable activity and power; as consul he exhibited a profound instinct for government and the reconstruction of society. But as a vainglorious emperor he profoundly misunderstood Europe, and Europe destroyed him; his faith in the French oligarchy he had created was chimerical, and his dream of the future was an hallucination. The Austrian alliance was an offence and a snare to the French people. Glory was their passion and free institutions were their ideal; his waning empire was both tyrannical and inglorious. The divorce between Napoleon and the French people would have been absolute, therefore, had not the Restoration de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

livered them into the hands of a system which flung them into an even deeper degradation than they had experienced during the last years of the Empire.

Comparison between Napoleon and the Hohenzollern is well-nigh impossible; their respective relations to those over whom a century since the great secular master of fighting and reigning placed himself on one hand and to the imperious conservatives of to-day in Germany on the other, under the mere weak, well-meaning tyro, as King and Emperor, an autocrat in name, the obedient creature of caste in fact—these two relations are simply incommensurable, and cannot be compared. In the Hohenzollern case there can be and may be the unconditional abdication of an individual, but it cannot be that of a system or a house which is the mask of a system, nation-wide and people-wide. The Napoleonic bureaucracy, military and civil, was capable and efficient; but since he had created it he managed to wield it as his tool so long as his vigor lasted. In exact proportion as premature age gradually but surely attacked his mental and physical powers the creature of his maturity became the despot of his decline.

The Prussian bureaucracy was made in feudal times by two masterful Hohenzollerns, the great Elector and the great King; thereafter it has been the carrier and the expression of national life. In its successive stages of evolution Germany has caught up the shibboleths of the outside world and practiced their pronunciation without grasping their sense. But the self-interest of the bureaucracy has controlled the German nations, catching their temper adroitly in every crisis and humoring their whims, dominating family, church, nobility, and crown without even a momentary loss of power. Autocrat! Extremes meet. In autocratic government the uneasy monarch is the servile tool of his people and of the bureaucracy which sits with its hand on their pulse. Of course the crown reacts; but enough only to maintain its state, and preserve appearances. The total disappearance from the scene of all the Hohenzollerns would not transform bureaucratic into popular government.

At the moment of Napoleon's abdication the Czar, being in one of his liberal moods, was well disposed towards an imperial regency; but the abject surrender to Austria of the entire vanguard of the imperial army compelled a division of influence and seemed to prove conclusively French intolerance of imperial influence in any form. Dynastic legitimacy gave the screw its turn and the Bourbons were restored to a throne whose sole support was dynastic. As yet no organized portion of the German army has surrendered; outside of two factions there is apparently no demand in Germany for William's abdication, and even that demand is made on the ground that his personality is an obstacle to peace, with the significant remark that the Crown Prince is not a fit person to succeed. The implication is that another of the sons might be. When the rout of Germany is complete there will be other and louder voices; when Foch dictates the military situation after unconditional surrender there will, under pressure from the victors, be an abdication in form; but an abdication totally meaningless unless our democratic Premiers are ready, as Bismarck was in 1870, to set up a government with which to negotiate.

The German masses in serried ranks are devoted to the feudal protection they enjoy—for they do enjoy it—in government; in commerce, industry, and agriculture; in the paternal guidance which gives them material prosperity, ease, and leisure. Whatever name and style be given to their coming state they will for generations revert to type and nearly a hundred million strong menace the march of free institutions on both flanks. The transformation process, if transformation there is to be in an unpolitical people detesting the unbroken strife of parties, must be warily inaugurated with superhuman wisdom. It can be done; but mere abdication will not do it. Stern justice there must be: the demobilization of armies, surrender of fleets and even alien territories, indemnity and restoration, the censor's erasure of all abominations. The French government is still bureaucratic in form, but the bureaucracy has at last, after an entire century, measurably been put into its place in a free system; something must be inaugurated in Germany similar to what was inaugurated in France under the Third Republic, whether monarchy survives in form or not. The process will be long because in order to be solid it must be gradual.

There have been a hundred centuries of true history; that is, of a record concerned with national life, and one century is relatively not long. The abdication of Napoleon inaugurated the period of dynastic concert, the toilsome agitations for liberty, and the evolution of freedom in the western system of nations. Perhaps the abdication of the Hohenzollern might start central and eastern Europe on a similar up-hill toilsome path. But ours is another age than that, and the people concerned are far more backward. If the German has displayed little genius for free institutions, the Slav has exhibited still less. To call license liberty is an outrage but precisely that is the practice throughout eastern and southeastern Europe, lands and peoples which to be known must be seen; folk after folk in the clan stage of development, delighting in ruthless forays, addicted to revolution, with many primitive virtues to be sure, but as fickle as a house cat, intoxicated with the verbiage of nationality and liberty, incapable of bridling passions and taming their animal natures for the general interest. Upon these Germany has looked with some fear and more contempt; to them the German Empire has been exactly what Rome was to the Germany of Tacitus's day: a glittering show of splendor and power, arousing an unquenchable longing for participation in its glories. To assume the responsibility for a regenerate Germany means responsibility for all the Hither East of Europe and incidentally even of Hither Asia. Upon whom or what are these tasks to devolve? Where is the Atlas to balance the globe? The answer can not be found in history because every plan for the peaceful evolution of society from the day of Queen Elizabeth onward, every scheme which political sagacity has been able to devise, has proved nugatory and utopian. Not one was able to stand the test because the basis of each was national self-denial. There was no provision for a policeman to restrain evil-doing and cheer the virtuous with a sense of security. There was not even a code of international law with a sanction of general morality, much less with one of force. Yet to-day it is the firm conviction of practical statesmen that an international court, whose decisions are to be enforced by international morals and an international army, can be established and maintained; that international law can be substantially codified at the outset, that its principles have struggled from darkness into light, and that step by step the series of decisions pronounced from the international bench will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cover every instance. In other words, the time is considered, by many sane men in private and public life, ripe for a league of nations to enforce peace; and to its congress, they say, may safely be entrusted the federation of nations willing to divest themselves of such portion of their sovereignty as may be essential to cement the pact. The world is to be its own Atlas, self-sustaining.

At first sight this suggests the Metternich system of a Holy Alliance, a Concert of Powers, and a policy of interventions. Cynics and conservative doubters suggest the parallel and denounce idealists who learn nothing from the experience of a century ago. The truth is that there is no possible parallel; on the contrary there is a striking contrast. Alexander I had an inchoate plan for a federation of nations, similar to that which our day has for some time gravely considered. It was rejected by the influence of just such toryism as makes broad its phylacteries now, by the stubborn determination of two arch-Pharisees, Castlereagh and Metternich, to hold the highest seat in the synagogue. The plan of Alexander was defective, but with all its incompleteness it was far more viable than the Concert of Powers which perished in early immaturity. The "Grand Design" of Henry IV was formed in 1598; William Penn's "Essay Towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe" was dated in 1693; St. Pierre's "Projet de Traité pour rendre la Paix Perpetuelle" was published in 1713; this was revamped by Rousseau in 1763, by Bentham and Kant in the revolutionary epoch, and now after another century the idea is once more to the fore.

Just about once in every hundred years of modern history a Frankenstein involves the world in general war, and at similar intervals there are suggested leagues with no curtailment of sovereignty and based on reason solely, or else federation founded on force with the substantial surrender of external sovereignty—all in the interest of lasting peace. To-day the Western Powers have under serious consideration a combination of the two: a minimum curtailment of international sovereignty in a league founded on the general moral sanction of international law maintaining a military police sufficiently strong to enforce its behests. Athwart the realization of such an ideal lie many obstacles: economic rivalry and tariffs, the chauvinistic patriotism which demands glory and power for one's own country, senseless and unreasoning passion for nationality, illogical devotion to some one form of society and government as a panacea for social unrest, standing military power on land and sea which imperatively demands employment, and the fickleness and instability of public opinion.

If, however, a new day be arisen, as in the belligerent union of a score of nations for a moral crusade we have reason fondly to hope, they are not insuperable. Viewed in the light of contemporary thought the Continental Congress was a poor thing; so was our first wretched Confederacy, and the Annapolis Convention was an economic shift; even the Constitution had to endure the ordeal by fire. If the western nations enter on the task of forming a league with the full illumination of the high morality which we believe dominates the twentieth century, the barriers of language, of race, and of tradition may be so far levelled as to make a working system for certain very practical purposes. The cost will be terrific. There must be peace armaments indefinitely perpetuated, but insignificant in size compared with existing ones. The pride of nationality must be humbled, the greed of the industrial age be checked, and the pursuit of wealth, individual and collective, be measurably halted. Above all, the expansion of imperial power in backward lands must stop short. The tutelage of inferior states and peoples must be confined to example.

The twists of history are like those of the screw which is an inclined plane ascending at each turn. In a way they are parallel in their curvature; but it is only the new level which tells. Comparative history reveals a depraved human nature which is extremely persistent and discourages those who are confident of human perfectibility. Nevertheless it does mount somewhat, however slowly, and we can find encouragement by contrasting the last century with this, enough stimulus to go forward in the effort to crush the infamies of swollen ambition and establish a peace on bases never before accepted, a peace of justice and equity as enduring as the stage of civilization from which it springs, safeguarding the industrious and honest nation against the conspirator and the robber. Every national house is in sore need of being set in order; if we succeed in the home task we may rest assured that the collective force of goodness will never be evil, and that the bonds of international federation will never gall. The world will come to rejoice in them as the infant rejoices in its swaddling clothes.

Joseph Conrad

By FRANK PEASE

MR. JOSEPH CONRAD has interested a world deeply disillusioned of objective adventures (although, indeed, it continued to read them), in the greater subjective adventures of character. But his pilgrimages into the subjective are not sublimated away from reality after the later manner of Henry James, or, more to the point, Walter Pater. Conrad's adventures also are intrinsic, yet they occur within a matrix astonishingly and convincingly actual. Unlike the old adventures, they do not, however, precisely depend upon this for development. Conrad's developments are from within. Their outer manifestations follow from this inner movement, but more naturally like the growth of a plant whose individuality is unquestioned yet upon whose intricate inner structure the whole of outer nature is at work insinuating itself powerfully, mysteriously, darkly, and inescapably. There is more here than dualism, more even than dependence: there is synchronism. Conrad's characters synchronize with their *mise en scène* in a continuity completely conspicuous (on his part) and completely satisfying; which is but another way of saying that in Conrad's art "reflex action," accident, surprise, the reportorial detailing of incidents for their own sake, have no part.

This synchronism of Conrad's has almost the effect of a conspiracy: a sustained and secret sympathy between the outer aspect and the inner reality. Often Conrad's men are vibrant with an enigmatical rhythm, the hidden diapason of some of nature's most forbidding mysteries. The dark heart of Kurtz is inseparable from the African heart of darkness. It drew darkness from that heart and gave darkness in turn. Karain's loneliness is akin to the isolation of his slight and insignificant foothold on the earth; an isolation "still, complete, unknown . . . where nothing could survive the coming of the night, and where each sun-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rise, like a dazzling act of special creation, was disconnected from the eve and the morrow." At Arsat's pool, The Lagoon, a deep deathlike quiet broods, a black silence, something of the obdurate hatred of Arsat's own heart wherein was no light and no peace; only blood and death.

The same synchronism, that subtle interweaving of outer and inner worlds, but differently exhibited, is found in the steadfast Captain MacWhirr. But it took the "immeasurable strength of immoderate wrath—the wrath and fury of the passionate sea," to penetrate the crustacean stolidity of Captain MacWhirr and find there that something which could synchronize with the high pitch, the terrifying and awful temper of that storm. In such character is the very *élan* of that tradition upon which the British merchant marine was founded. Captain MacWhirr, even as Old Singleton, is epic; and it is such an epic spirit which manned trading ships of all the ages from Phœnician trireme to Spanish galleon; and its voice—"that frail and indomitable sound"—found words to inspire the deeds that defied, circumvented, and all but mastered this masterless element. Captain MacWhirr is an excellent example of Conrad's almost occult power in revealing the subtle intersections, the sometimes inverted correspondence always so continuous and so synchronistic between the exterior apprehendable world of more obviously conditioned things and the inner invisible fabric of feeling and perception, of will and motive which is character.

To sensitized literary appetites no longer keen for the accidental, Conrad's thesis that for good or evil literary characters must possess character comes as a veritable Attic rebirth of adventure. Indeed, he has gone even further and reaffirmed the ancient doctrine that a man's character is his fate. In revealing this there is an inner consistency to the motives of his principal figures that gives their adventures the quality of "premonitory, implacable, almost fatalistic certitude." Witness Tuan Jim: was ever a man so storm-tossed upon that "inner region of stress and strife" which is character? Was ever a man's end so inevitable, or so satisfying? And "Our Man," Nostromo, a stalwart pagan fellow, one of those who work at the subjugation of nature with firm, sure hands, a phenomenon justifiable so long as it is nature and not "life" that engages his energies—was there not a fatal flaw in this Nostromo, something of that "ignoble freedom" which would not brook the "austere servitude of the sea," that servitude which is Conrad's touchstone and whose only reward, he says, is the satisfaction of trust fulfilled and the illusion of mastery?

Of the character which is fate, two different phases, both unforgettably sinister, are Alice Jacobus and Amy Foster. Conrad has here penetrated a twilight zone of shadows and futility, delving among those helpless and not to be helped "pockets" of life, those "blind lines," as the biologists phrase it, which we all know are tragically frequent. Here are souls in a very welter of stagnation: souls without a past to connect them with a present and lost in a somnolence that denies, rather effaces, all possibility of a future, creatures so insulate from life's potentialities as to confound—did it ever pause to think—modernity's "hard absolute optimism." It is not often one finds anything in literature comparable to these voiceless ones to whom Conrad has given voice, only—alas!—to find they have nothing to say. Perhaps in some of the sinister tales of Arthur Morrison's mean streets, in Henry James's "Author of Beltraffio," in Mrs. Wharton's "Ethan Frome," or in the "Three Lives" of Gertrude Stein, the character which is fate finds its darkest level.

In Conrad's men the capacity for self-deception, for picturing continuation along the old lines "afterward"—as in the ghastly example of Willems—is an integral part of his conception that character and fate are one and inseparable. For Conrad senses too deeply the irrevocable nature of Becoming and the inextricable fatality with which character dovetails into outer circumstance—especially untoward circumstance—to see any way out for a man except through the highways and byways of his own character. Conrad knows of no royal road, no short-cuts, no side-steppings of the fate that is intrinsic. "The heavens do not fall for a trifle," he says. To such men as Almayer, Willems, Lord Jim, Nostromo, and Razumov beginnings are always trifles. But the heavens would needs fall to undo such trifles whose origin is in character.

From the commanding heights of Conrad's achievement we are now able to discern what was lacking in the crew of that older three-decked ship of adventure. Sailing those seven seas of an ever-auspicious romance, they had experiences but never attained experience. There was a very great deal of "scenery," an amazing sequence of "situations," many quite impossible, absurdly labyrinthine, through whose corridors of circumstance the characters rolled like hard smooth marbles gathering in their flight neither the scars of wisdom nor the spoils of memory. That is what they missed, those impeccable heroes and heroines before Conrad: the scars and the wisdom. Like "the girl" in "The Informer" and Felicia in "The Planter of Malata," they were, to use the term Conrad has empowered as no other single term in the English language, *gestures*: "Gestures! Mere gestures and nothing else. . . . That is why their kind is fated to perish!"

It took Conrad to show us this. But he did not destroy adventure in the showing. He has remade it. And he has pointed a mystery, in the outer world's imposing array of physical aspects, all-pervading and poignant in its most casual movements: a mystery sometimes kind, sometimes sinister, in his hands always intensified, never without its lasting subjective effects. But he invokes no unrevealing metaphysic for this. It is all there in the vivid delineation of "the old, old words, worn thin, defaced by ages of careless usage," and set forth with a minute and illuminating detail that conveys a feeling of undeniable actuality to his realism and an undoubted possibility to his incidents. Since Conrad's *pronunciamento* that his literary characters are "infinitely more poignant and real" than many peoples' lives, "because informed with passion, possessed of convictions, involved in great affairs created out of my own substance for an anxiously meditated end," it is no longer permissible for the creatures of literature to pass through the world without partaking of it.

Now the man who could do that to literature is more than a writer of books: he is an institution. Conrad is, to use a pertinent colloquialism, a "change in the angle," a point of departure. We had grown tired of adventure without experience, just as in days gone by men tired of the tediously long, if enchanting, poem. Yet all the while a voice called for adventure: adventure which should not repudiate the visible world after the manner of both decadent and mystic, nor distort it with the ingeniously impossible; but adventure which would depict amid the tangled moment of "cause and effect," of institutions, calamities or hopes, illu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sions or futilities, a subtler movement still—that invincible movement towards light or darkness of character. We can see this now that Conrad has illustrated it; and we can see, too, that it is a culminating point in the history of adventure. In the art of Joseph Conrad we have adventure's coming-of-age. After Conrad, taste in literature can never again tolerate that excessive interest in adventures or incidents for their own sake, instead of for their effect upon character.

An even greater impetus in a new direction is one that will come from Conrad's almost miraculous and complete escape from the pitfalls of those modern delusions, those masks of "*kultur*" with which English literature has all unconsciously tricked itself out; sociology and its distorted twin, political economy. It is this distinction which constitutes Conrad's point of departure, his parting of the ways for future literature from all that confused labyrinth whose premise is the *contrat social*. In these days for a man to write a score of books without a single "problem" in them —is not this a marvel? It is, *par exemple*, the order of rank that exists between Sir Thomas Browne's "Religio Medici" and Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," between Stendhal and the Encyclopædists, between Thackeray and Dickens, between Meredith's "Egoist" and Kingsley's "Yeast," between Théophile Gautier and Zola, Ibsen and Björnson, Turgenev and Tolstoy. It is the distinction between literature that is art and literature that is not art. In short, Conrad's is the discrimination which moralizes about life instead of moralizing about morals.

Where Conrad speaks of "the old, old words, worn thin, defaced by ages of careless usage," one might well substitute "the old, old morals, worn thin, defaced by ages of careless usage," and he would almost have the formula of Conrad's moral outlook. Yet seldom do we find modern literature engaged upon Conrad's task of illuminating that inner dark whose "cruel battles of hunger and thought" occur when a man strives to be "faithful to that ideal conception of one's own personality that every man sets up for himself secretly."

"Evolution" and "environment" have constituted a modern literary scapegoat just where subtlety, penetration, and imagination, not to mention the boldness of a considerable sincerity, an exquisite and disciplined selectiveness, and an undaunted intellectual honesty are most needed. It is part of Conrad's genius that he possesses the power of meditative thought as opposed to hasty empiricism, the quick reaction to every external stimulus so characteristic of the age and so obstructive to all time-defying achievements in literature. It is this meditative quality which enables him to sense so deeply the infinite slowness of history's movements. By it he has likewise discerned how fixed and how necessary are the functions of rulership and of service. Not interpreting the mission of literature as merely recreative, or looking upon art's purpose as nothing more than art, Conrad has created literature which comes easily within these purposes, and yet another still—he perceives the truth that all art sooner or later has its influence upon life. His understanding of literature's place in the human scene is its function in the social pyramid as moral stabilizer.

In the long run, if social stability itself depends upon the customs and values implicit in an order of personal relations between the directing and executing forces, then their neglect has had the effect of throwing a very great strain upon the old morals, an almost greater strain, indeed, than they could bear. But these older verities, the ancient and eternal fitness of class divisions, the elusive but essential qualities which go to make up reverence towards excellence and superiority wherever it is met (an astonishing example is Conrad's deeply appreciative delineation of Ransome in "The Shadow Line"), fidelity to the small unheralded tasks, that myriad of acts and attitudes often in themselves insignificant, yet upon which whole societies in the past have securely rested and whose sum is the depth and breadth of the tabernacle itself—these were ignored as being of profound importance: matters over which literature should be as a shepherd to his flock.

To modern literature's uncertainties and disintegrations, its lapses of memory and its falsities, it has been Joseph Conrad's high destiny to cry "Halt!" Against the vulgar realisms and ignoble indifferences of what may be called literature's Third Estate, no less than against the incongruities of the old adventure, Joseph Conrad has accomplished a *coup d'état*. His "About Face!" is directed towards a period long past, when what men were taught through the arts held all the import of life and death; something as it must have been in the long beginning of English literature, the days of scop and gleeman when, clothed in their heroic vesture of vivid, deathless words, "values" sprang direct from deeds; something as it was before our truce of lackadaisical conventions had disarmed the guard, levelled the walls, and lulled men to indifference, to a false sense of triumph and security from the everlasting foe of mankind.

What this foe is—he has sometimes personified it as the "Dark Powers"—Conrad shows us in a motley of masks, forms, attitudes, personalities, and deeds, but nowhere more simply or more desperately than in Donkin's character in "The Nigger of the Narcissus":

> . . . the creature that knows all about his rights, but knows nothing of courage, of endurance, and of the unexpressed faith, of the unspoken loyalty that knits together a ship's company. . . . The independent offspring of the ignoble freedom of the slums full of disdain and hate for the austere servitude of the sea. Is there a spot on earth where such a man is unknown, an ominous survival testifying to the eternal fitness of lies and impudence?

With that astonishing *procés verbal*, "the independent offspring of the ignoble freedom of the slums," Conrad throws one of those sudden, sharp, searchlight gleams of art across the troubled waters of the world, surveying, analyzing, summing up a whole macrocosm of cause and effect, illuminating suggestively in a single superb phrase both genesis and corrective. In Lord Jim we get a deeper glimpse of the foe, albeit considerably modified. In the socially approved corrosions of Charles Gould's soul is another aspect; in Doctor Monyghan's nemesis of memory another; and still another in that remarkable character, Razumov, a man with instinct for the best, but lacking that surplus of will to unloose himself from the foe's protean and inexorable malevolence. Almost every one of Conrad's characters is thus locked in a life and death struggle with the foe. It is part of Conrad's sensation of the texture of life. And living up to or falling away from the code—man's only weapon against the foe—is the *deus ex machina* of Conrad's art.

Conrad's art doctrine as set forth in the "Suppressed Preface," in "A Familiar Preface," and throughout "A Personal Record," is a glorious exalting of *l'art pour l'art*. But his art itself, at least to our age, has not that passionless

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

white note of pure æsthetics which is the epicurean tradition of art for art's sake. Conrad's art is rather more human, and as human is, consequently, more "moral." Is there a deeper tribute to be rendered an artist than to recognize that everything he handles is thereby deepened, dignified, transfigured, and exalted? Is it too much to say of such an art that one cannot touch it and remain the same? It is in this sense and to this degree that Joseph Conrad is pre-eminently the artist-moralist of our age. To achieve this Conrad has played upon most of our deepest sensibilities: satire, irony, laughter, and tears, "our desire of unrest," our abiding instinct for the tragic, our persistent appetite for retribution; and one thing more—that "glimpse of truth for which we had forgotten to ask," that something in our hearts which was in the heart of Abdulla when, *after* his enemy was dead, "in a solemn whisper he breathed out piously the name of Allah! The Merciful! The Compassionate!"

Babushka

DESPITE the confusion and excesses that inevitably accompany every great social movement, the Russian Revolution stands out to-day as the most inspiring event since the French Revolution. In the midst of the great process Catherine Breshkovsky has died—Catherine Breshkovsky, whose devotion of fifty years culminated in such a triumph as has rarely rewarded human effort. Had she died immediately after the crowning of her hopes in the March Revolution, when all Russia rejoiced to pay her homage, it would have seemed the perfect fulfilment of a devoted life. But she had labored not for revolution alone, but for liberty, and towards true liberty the Revolution was but the first step. The woman whose labors had long been confined to the fellowship of exiles in Siberia was carried in state across the wide plains, and borne by soldiers through cheering cities, to be waited on by Ministers in the Winter Palace. Even at the height of her triumph she pleaded for printing presses, and continued her teaching, as eager to disseminate progressive literature from the windows of the private car assigned her by the Provisional Government as from the pack she carried in her itinerant girlhood. Now, indeed, at the age of seventy-five, with fifty years of prison and exile behind her, she felt that the doors of opportunity were at last thrown wide to her mission of education.

Leadership she never sought and thus she escaped the curse of power. She began life as a teacher, and a teacher she remained to the end—but what a teacher! Gifted with a remarkable mind, clear insight, and active sympathy, an eager imagination, a steadfast devotion to truth, a singing courage, a keen joy in living, and an entire unconsciousness of self, her greatest quality was love—love of nature, of beauty, of truth, but above all of men and women. It left no place for hatred, fear, despair, or cowardice. Revenge and bitterness were closed byways; she walked always in the light, whether the path led to solitary cell or to chains in the mines. Deprived though she might be of freedom, sunlight, health, and companionship, one thing could not be taken from her, and that was the invincible power of a great spirit.

What a far cry from Chekhov's gloomy failures to this woman's life! Yet her surroundings in girlhood were those of Chekhov's aristocracy. But young Katya's soul cried out for action. Neither dulled by the luxury of the manor-house nor numbed by the unending sufferings of the dependent serfs, as a girl she set about making her own small world more tolerable. Her little vineyard—aristocracy crumbling with dry-rot, and peasanthood just growing out of the soil of serfdom—called for great labor of pruning, cultivating, and training. Her real work began with the newly-freed serfs at her gate. She loved them, and then taught them. But the sequence was not popular with the bureaucracy. Simple Christianity often complicates officialdom. Teaching peasants was forbidden. Catherine Breshkovsky turned to the workers in the towns and became both teacher and pupil. With two comrades, pack on back, she trudged from village to village, trying to win the peasants with words if she might not with books. The authorities grudged her her humble following, and she was arrested and imprisoned. This was her confirmation. What had been impulse crystallized into life purpose.

There followed a half century of suffering—dark cells, interminable marches, hard labor underground, loneliness, filth, disease, hunger, arctic cold. Through it all, however confined her body, her mind ranged free, looking always towards the bringing in of liberty. Her influence made itself felt over Siberia, Russia, and Europe. Even in the United States her name stirred the imagination fully thirty years ago, when George Kennan recounted his meeting with her in a meagre hamlet on the Chinese border. "Neither hardship, nor exile, nor penal servitude had been able to break her brave, finely tempered spirit, or to shake her convictions of honor and duty."

The few months she spent in this country in 1904-5 did more than anything had ever done before to bring Americans into personal sympathy with Russia. To those who saw Madame Breshkovsky or heard her speak she was Russia, and her well-being a matter of intimate concern. Even to those who only read her words it was a moving sorrow when she was again imprisoned. And in many an American household the month of March, 1917, brought devout thanksgiving that Babushka's bloodless revolution had come to pass. They rejoiced for her only less than for her Russia.

But the Revolution was not to stop with the mere overthrow of the old régime. Like all great popular movements, it quickly outran the thought and desire of its original leaders, and even the Social Revolutionists were soon left far behind. And so the heroic old age of Catherine Breshkovsky was not destined to be crowned with peace. In the earlier stages of the Revolution, indeed, her advice was for a time sought in counsel, but with the onrush of irresistible popular forces the day came when Russia's new leaders turned toward immediate ends that she had not sought, turned to the use of methods of which she could not approve, and she herself was even spirited into hiding by her friends. Her last months cannot have been other than months of sorrow and disappointment, and now she is gone, too early to see the final fruition of her work and her teaching in a Russia free and self-controlled. Yet to the millions that knew her that valiant spirit still shines forth in the darkness—a symbol of the real Russia that is groping its way forward to liberty. The heart that never knew fear or discouragement or malice still beats in Russia, though the greatest woman of our time—Babushka the beloved—is dead.

M. H. B. M.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Correspondence

Bankrupt Europe

London, September 25

IN the September *Contemporary Review* there appeared, under the heading of "President Wilson's Opportunity," a remarkable article signed by Brougham Villiers, author of "Britain After the Peace" and other well-known discussions of economic subjects. Starting from the certainty that, when the war comes to an end, the nations of Continental Europe will be face to face with bankruptcy, Mr. Villiers argues that their only means of avoiding that fate will be by obtaining assistance from outside their own borders. They will need money to pay the interest on their debts until they have had time to reconstruct their financial systems, and credit to buy raw materials to set their industries going. At that time the United States alone will possess a large reserve of credit, while containing within its own borders a large stock of the materials of industry. This position places in the hands of the American President a diplomatic weapon of which it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance. He could encourage American financiers to lend to the European Governments, but only on condition that they should enter a league of nations, accept disarmament, and adopt a democratic system generally—in other words, that they should give every possible security against the return of such conditions as led to the present war.

Mr. Villiers readily consented to my request that he should talk over his project with me for the benefit of the readers of the *Nation*. I first asked him whether there was any historical precedent for it. "Not that I am aware of," was the reply. "But then there is no historical precedent for the situation. The belligerent Governments of the Continent are hopelessly bankrupt. Take the case of Germany. Even assuming that she re-imposes all her pre-war taxes (including the import duty on food), that they bring in as much as they did before the war, and that she obtains as much as she expects from the new taxes imposed during the war, she will confront a deficit of about $2,000,000,000 a year. This is Mr. Bonar Law's estimate, based on the supposition that the war does not last beyond March next. My own calculations, though proceeding on a different method, confirm Mr. Law's figures. Now Germany has made no provision whatever for meeting this deficit. Nor can she make such provision without taxing her Junkers and big capitalists to the extent indicated—probably more than half their total income. This would be a revolution in itself. Hitherto, militarism has been a paying proposition to the wealthy classes of Germany. It was financed partly by taxes on food, etc., which raised prices and rents, and partly by loans, which provided rich men with a convenient and, as they thought, safe investment for surplus wealth. Incidentally, the army provided careers and salaries for younger sons. But the German revenue as it was before the war has fallen to pieces, and the new taxes are all experimental and, I am convinced, cannot yield anything like what they are expected to produce. If so, the deficit will actually be very much larger than the sum already named. But even according to that estimate it will mean that, after the war, there will be every six months a sum of $1,000,000,000 falling due—an amount equal to the indemnity extracted from France in 1871—for which not a cent has been provided. No nation can build up an entirely new system of finance in a day, and a day of indescribable confusion at that. Germany will have to borrow or default, and if she defaults the classes who have invested in war loans are bankrupt. That involves the ruin of the German banks that have lent money on war bonds, and consequently of all the businesses, large and small, that rest on the banks for support."

"And what of the other European Governments?"

"The picture I have just drawn will represent, very largely, the situation in them also. The case of France will be nearly as bad, and that of Austria worse. In all the belligerent countries of the Continent the financial system collapsed when the war broke out. They will all be confronted with difficulties similar to those of Germany with regard both to the restoration of the old taxes and the discovery of new sources of revenue. The amount of money they, including Germany, will have to find every half year for the payment of interest cannot come to less than $2,500,000,000. There is no precedent in the history of the world for such a state of things, at least on anything like this scale, and the course taken to meet it must be unprecedented."

"Your suggestion," I remarked, "is based on the assumption that the war ends not later than next March. Have you considered the possibility that it may last two or three years longer? By that time the needs of the European Governments will have become immensely greater, and America herself will inevitably have had, meantime, to meet such a call upon her resources that her capacity of helping Europe will be much reduced. What then?"

"For myself," replied Mr. Villiers, "I think such a prolongation of the war exceedingly doubtful, but in that case there will be no way to save European civilization, and the United States will have missed a glorious opportunity. If the war had ended last year, the rôle I am suggesting for America might have been undertaken by Great Britain, but the drain upon our financial and economic resources since then has been such that we could no longer attempt it. It is the story of the Sibylline Books over again."

"You contemplate, I understand, that the help to be offered would come from private financiers, and not from the United States Government?"

"In the first place, yes. Of course, private financiers in America will have no lack of profitable investments available, in view of the demand for capital that will come from all parts of the world. As an investment, the lending of money to European States on the verge of bankruptcy will be the least tempting of all imaginable propositions, unless there are provided such guarantees as I propose. It would be for the President to make sure that these guarantees were obtained, and then he could use his influence to obtain a response from Wall Street. Failing such a response, I see no reason why the national Government itself should not come to the rescue of the European Governments by offering them loans on these terms—assuming, of course, that there is no constitutional difficulty in the way."

"Do you not think that some countries would prefer to starve rather than accept assistance under such drastic conditions from a benefactor who was standing over them, so to speak, whip in hand?"

"It is not so much a question of the countries starving—they will still be able to grow food, dig up minerals, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so on—as of the financial position of their Governments. But there will be no need to approach them at all with an offer. They will come cap in hand to you, and the United States will have a perfect right, before lending money, to examine the security. If these nations are willing to impose adequate taxation upon the classes that have hitherto profited by militarism, and are ready at the same time to reduce expenses and make peace secure by disbanding their armies, the security may be worth looking at. If not, I advise Uncle Sam to keep his money in his pocket. He need not fear frightening them away: they will come back again on his terms after a little more experience of the trouble they are in."

When I invited from Mr. Villiers an opinion on the relation between his proposal and Sidney Webb's scheme for an international rationing of food and raw materials, he pointed out that, under any rationing scheme, people would have to pay for their rations. There would be no free distribution. "The manufacturer who wants coal, for instance, will need to possess either money or credit. In order that he may have either, his war bonds and other securities must be worth more than the paper they are printed on. If his own Government cannot pay the interest on its debt, these bonds will be worth nothing and he will be able to get no coal. Thus, the solvent nations will not only have to ration raw materials but to supply credit also, and they will be mad if they allow that credit to be used to build up another armed peace."

In my last question to Mr. Villiers, I asked him whether his plan did not presuppose the failure of the Allies to secure the kind of peace they declare themselves to be fighting for. *Ex hypothesi*, the ends which his proposal seeks to bring about—a league of nations, disarmament, and the democratization of the governments—will already have been attained by the terms of the peace treaty, and there will accordingly be no need to bring subsequent financial pressure to bear in the same direction. I found, however, that Mr. Villiers attached little importance to the question of the peace treaty. In his judgment, whether it was a patched-up peace or a dictated peace would make little practical difference. "The power of the liberal states to influence the ultimate settlement of Europe depends," he said, "far less on the military situation at the close of the war, or even on the terms inserted in the peace treaty, than on the amount of money the belligerent governments will have left at the close of the war. What will really matter will be the position when their statesmen return from the Peace Conference and have to face the music at home. Whatever concessions they may have made or refused to make at the Conference, their ordeal will begin as soon as they attempt to deal with the domestic crisis that will then confront them." HERBERT W. HORWILL

Contributors to this Issue

LOUIS LEVINE is professor of economics in the University of Montana.

WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE is research professor of history in Columbia University.

FRANK PEASE has made special studies of the work of Joseph Conrad.

The Holy Alliance of the Nations

By PIERRE JEAN DE BERANGER, 1818

Translated by Margarete Münsterberg

I SAW how Peace flew down to earth and trod
With blesséd steps, and gold and flowers strewed.
The air was calm, and of the battle-god
She held the raging thunderbolts subdued.
"Ah!" thus she spoke, "in valor ye are peers,
French, English, Belgian, Russian, German lands:
Holy alliance form, and without fears,
Ye peoples, now clasp hands!

"Poor mortals, so much hatred wearies all;
Your sleep is rare, and then but lightly spun.
Divide more justly this too narrow ball,
And each shall have his own place in the sun.
From paths of true contentment you have strayed
To draw the chariot fierce that Might commands.
Holy alliance form, and unafraid,
Ye peoples, now clasp hands!"

In the Driftway

IN a passenger-coach of a Southern train the other day a friend of The Drifter espied a veteran of Pershing's army. Upon an empty sleeve were two six months' foreign service stripes and a wound chevron, and on his breast a medal of honor. Ordinarily it would seem as if one who had sacrificed as much for his country and democracy would be certain of all courtesy and friendliness from every fellow-citizen he met. But as he sat there the conductor of the train came to him and touching his worn uniform said, "You're in the wrong coach. You b'long in the Jim Crow car. Get out of here." The Negro looked him steadily in the eyes. "I'll stay right here," he said firmly. "You could have talked to me that way once, but you cahn't *now!*" and he pointed to his empty sleeve. "All right," said the conductor, "I'll soon fix you." Whereupon he called a burly brakeman and they were about to throw this one-armed veteran out of the car when the gorge of the Southern men who witnessed this humiliating scene rose, the train hands were ordered to desist, and Pershing's veteran rode on in peace, the sole colored man in a carload of whites. "Oh, very well," said the conductor just before he slammed the door, "that's just like you white folks; first you make the laws and then you break them." There are a good many laws that ought to be broken nowadays, The Drifter thinks, which affect the colored people. After the 150,000 colored men now in France return from their glorious share in Pershing's victory shall we continue to Jim-Crow them, disfranchise them and remind them that though they may be good enough to fight for Uncle Sam they are still to be despised at home?

* * * * *

WHEN Samuel Gompers returns to this country from England he will be entitled to a rest as well as a great reception in Chicago, for life has been exceedingly strenuous for him in England. In addition to the frank

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

handling he got at the Inter-Allied Labor Conference, I have run across an amusing account of his experience with the time-honored English institution of "heckling," at a meeting of delegates of the London Trades Council at Chandos Hall. I take from the Tory *Morning Post* the following account of what took place. At the outset interrupted, he declared he would stop talking if unwarranted interruptions were permitted (Cheers); whereupon he was again interrupted. From that point on the story runs thus:

> Continuing, he remarked that he had come to give some idea of the Trade Unionism of America. This he proceeded to do until further interruptions caused him to remark, "I am not asking for sympathy—(A Voice: "There is no money in sympathy")—and the man who infers, directly or indirectly, or insinuates that I am out to obtain money says that which is black as hell and a lie." (Cheers.) Trade Unionists in his country had agreed that during the war there ought not to be any strikes or lock-outs, and that women should receive men's pay for doing similar work. Replying to an interrupter, who called out, "What about the independence of Ireland?" Mr. Gompers retorted that he had never yet heard a member of the Irish Nationalist Party suggest that Ireland wanted independence, considering her helpless condition on the seas. Asked what he thought about Sir Edward Carson, he replied that it was doubtful whether some people read anything except through German eyes. (Laughter.) As to this being a capitalist war, he inquired: Were the murdered cooks, waiters, and seamen of the *Lusitania* capitalists? (Hear, hear.) This was a war against war. If ever there was a war vital to the mass of the people, and in which all democratic interests were involved, this was the war. (Cheers.) American Labor men had no animus against the Labor men of Germany, but if they stood up to fight the American democracies, comprising men of every race and language under the sun, must fight, and would do so. (Cheers.)

* * * * *

THERE is a good old-fashioned pioneering flavor to Miss Anne Martin's campaign in Nevada. Running independently, without backing of party or newspaper, she is travelling the State over, as far as she is able, visiting personally every group of miners and cattle-men, scattered throughout that mining and ranching district. Her programme includes replacement of the old wage system by a true industrial democracy; full political and industrial rights for women; popular control of Nevada's land, mines, and stock; prohibition for State and nation. Recently in Elko, the political stronghold of her chief opponent, C. B. Henderson, no theatre, church, hotel, business house, not even a deserted saloon building could be obtained for her campaign meetings. An attempt was made to keep her from holding street meetings under threat of arrest. But the railroad men of the town came forward with the offer of a labor hall. Her opponents a month ago would not concede her 2,000 votes out of an estimated 30,000. To-day they are grudgingly prophesying four times that number for her—and 10,000 votes will very probably elect the next Senator from Nevada. Miss Martin has been up and down the State many times before urging the right of woman suffrage, and when suffrage, largely through her efforts, was won in Nevada, she moved to Washington and has been lobbying ever since for the Federal Amendment.

* * * * *

I WONDER how many of the *Nation's* readers are aware that Liza Lehmann, the gifted song-writer who died in London the other day, was in private life Mrs. Herbert Bedford. Perhaps this fact that she was an Englishwoman by marriage as well as by birth will deter zealous patriots from refusing to sing her charming songs because her German name is attached to them. She made her professional début as a soprano in 1885, and from then until her marriage in 1894 was in great demand. From that year on she devoted herself to composition, which she had studied under Raunkile at Rome, Freudenberg at Wiesbaden, and Hamish MacCunn in London. It was her song-cycle "In a Persian Garden," the words from the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam, which made her famous, and its charm wanes not at all. "The Daisy Chain," "More Daisies," and "Nonsense Songs from Alice in Wonderland" also rank high, and those who heard her light opera, "The Vicar of Wakefield," could well understand why it did not last long on Broadway—it was much too good to win popular favor. Her versatility was also shown in "Sergeant Brue," a musical farce which was a London success. All told, there was a virility and freshness and originality about her work that made it really distinguished, and made her one of the women composers to give the lie to those who believe that women will never be capable of great creative things in the art world. If they have as yet produced no one to rank with the great masters there is every reason to believe that they will some day do so.

Correspondence

Gallicizing the Boston Orchestra

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Henry T. Finck stated in your issue of October 12, that "the Boston Orchestra has lately been thoroughly Americanized as well as unionized." The negotiations, undertaken last May between members of the orchestra and officers of the American Federation of Musicians came to nothing, as the newspapers of Boston recorded at the time, and the band is still outside the union. Furthermore, the new conductors, both temporary and permanent—MM. Monteux and Rabaud—are Parisians; while the more important newcomers to the orchestra are almost wholly French. Only in the rank and file of the strings is there any appreciable increase in Americans. Much more truly, the Boston Orchestra has been Gallicized.

H. T. PARKER

Boston, October 17

Partisanship Versus Patriotism

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I note in your issue of September 14, which came to hand after some delay, an advertisement of a new edition of a standard textbook of European history, which is announced as "not neutral," but "American through and through."

I think that I should not be classed, by the people in my own community, as lacking in patriotism. I have been on the list of speakers for the promotion of every financial "drive" in our country during the war. Mr. Hoover might have sat at every meal which has been served at the table in our home. To the best of my ability, I have bought war savings stamps and Liberty Bonds. I can say, "To Hell with the Kaiser" from the depths of my heart. I am a "bitter-ender" too radical for my St. Louis friend, William Marion Reedy, who is patriotic enough, in all conscience.

But I do want to protest against the school children of America being fed on "history" which advertises itself as partisan in spirit, and is put on the market in response to the demands of a public spirit wrought up to meet the exigencies of war. And I do not know where else to send the protest than to the *Nation*.

Of course, a war is no time to talk of the virtues of an enemy. It may be treason to suggest that he has any. And any thoughtful man must admit that such virtues as Germany may possess

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been carefully camouflaged for the past four years. But we are educating our children, not for the period of the war alone, but for the remainder of their lives; we hope that we are educating them for long years of peace, in which world-patriotism shall be developed to a controlling degree. The provincialism which rewrites history from the standpoint of a single nation is the enemy of everything which we hope will grow out of the bitter battlings of our day.

Such writing is what Germany has been doing for forty years. The whole development of mankind has been represented as only a preparation for the world-empire of the Kaiser. The ruthlessness of the German armies is the result of education for two generations in schools where textbook and teaching were "not neutral," but (German) "through and through." Can't we defeat Germany without patterning after the methods which have made the German nation an international outlaw?

CHARLES B. MITCHELL

Miami, Oklahoma, September 28

Hudson and Thames

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apropos of "A Question of Geography" in the *Nation* of September 21, I would instance our humility in teaching our own geography when inviting comparison with the countries of our allies. A recent supplementary geographical reader speaks thus of one of our noblest rivers:

"The Hudson is a small but a very important river. At its mouth is situated the largest city in the New World. . . . The Thames, also, is a small river, but near its mouth is situated London, the metropolis of the world."

This enlightening comparison is from Chamberlain's "Europe" (Macmillan, 1917). WESTCHESTER

New York, September 24

An Undergraduate View of the University

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As a student in one of our largest and most liberal universities I have had occasion to observe and experience the workings of our current educational system at its best—and feel myself greatly indebted to it. But this debt I owe, not to the institution as such, but to some of my teachers who have had influence because of what they are in themselves.

Our higher institutions were created primarily to educate the minister of the gospel or the gentleman of leisure. Their traditions are in direct contrast with the basic principles of current political and social life. Democracy requires powers of coöperation, insight into the various problems of modern social life, initiative, self-reliance, a sense of relative values, and the ability to sink individual differences in the interest of team work. But what college curriculum can be said even to make a pretence at the achievement of these things? To train people to solve problems in a democratic way requires the application of the democratic method to the process of teaching. I realize the differences between student and teacher in age, experience, interest, point of view, and purpose. However, it is just because of these great divergences that some democratic method would prove an invaluable and refreshing experience to both.

My other specific criticism is that college life is too one-sided; it is too much occupied with the head and too little with the hand. To confine teacher and student to purely intellectual interests takes them away from the real living world and places them in an artificial atmosphere. Every one at the university ought to be expected to do a minimum of useful physical labor. The organization and control of this labor might well become the chief background of the democratic organization of the university—where the teacher and student would meet not only to do similar work, but to discuss and legislate for the problems pertaining to it. What is more, this work could in a measure be used to help defray the cost of the university.

If the proposed Independent School of Social Science is to achieve the results its friends are hoping for—the training of men and women possessing a strong civic sense, an insight into some of the more significant problems now confronting the world, a mastery of the essentials of the democratic method, and a power of coöperation—it must provide for greater comradeship between teacher and student and it must make provision for useful physical labor as a part of the regular university life. The introduction of democracy and labor and the organization of the external control upon some guild basis would go far to help make both learning and teaching a vital and interesting experience. FRANK TANNENBAUM.

New York, October 1

The American Jew

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Interesting and illuminating in many ways as is the article "Yiddish Books and their Readers," by A. A. Roback, in your issue of October 12, it is misleading to the general reader who is not *au fait* with conditions obtaining among the Jews in the United States. True Yiddish-speaking Jews are in the great majority now owing to the mass emigration from Russia during the past few decades. But the children and grandchildren of these Yiddish-speaking immigrants are discarding and will discard Yiddish more and more with the passing of time. Yiddish is at best a mongrel tongue, a mixture of Hebrew and German with a sprinkling of words from other languages—Polish, Latin, French, Italian, English, and the like. As ghetto existence and ghetto conditions disappear in the wake of freedom, Yiddish, the language of the ghetto, will also gradually disappear and make way for the language of the country which will have become the home of the Jews in question, whether now it be English in England and the United States, French in France, Italian in Italy, or German in Germany.

There is one paragraph in Mr. Roback's article to which I, as an American, and I am sure also many of my American coreligionists, take serious objection. That is the paragraph in which the attitude of the Jews towards American literature is discussed. I have in mind particularly these sentences: "There seems to be a wide gulf between the literary taste of the American and that of the Jew. To determine what constitutes this gulf is a task for the ethnic psychologist." Mr. Roback commits the mistake so commonly made of positing a distinction between the American and the Jew as different national entities. I do not for a moment overlook the fact that there are many Jews who by the advocacy of a distinct Jewish nationalism justify such a conclusion on the part of non-Jews. But there are on the other hand thousands of Jews who hold that the Jews constitute not a nation but an international religious community. As such a one I resent deeply the statement that there is "a wide gulf between the literary taste of the American and that of the Jew." Literary taste is individual at best. There are Yiddish-speaking Jews who prefer Perez to Howells without a doubt, for Perez speaks a language and interprets an environment with which they have been familiar from childhood; but there are on the other hand English-speaking Jews who prefer Howells to Perez because Howells writes a language and interprets an environment to which they have been accustomed from their birth and throughout their lives. Mr. Roback might have said with more truth that there is a wide gulf between the literary taste of the American Jew, educated in the American public school and the American university, and that of the ghetto Jew, reared in the Russian pale and continuing the mental outlook of that pale in the ghettos of our cities. Jews are of many nationalities, and should not be contrasted with Americans in this manner since there are any number of Jews who are fully as American in spirit and in feeling as any American of any faith. At least this is my own case. I was born in this country, was educated in the public schools, graduated from an American university and have officiated as rabbi in an American Jewish congregation for thirty years. For me Yiddish literature is an exotic; American literature is the product of my native land; Hebrew literature is my religious heritage. My American nationality and my Jewish faith are not mutually exclusive, quite the contrary; the contrast is not between American and Jew but between American and German and between Jew and Christian.

DAVID PHILIPSON

Cincinnati, October 15

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

War Time Credit

Credit of the Nations: A Study of the European War. By J. Laurence Laughlin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $3.50.

THIS book is in many respects the most comprehensive discussion of the practical and theoretical economic problems arising from the war which has yet come to our notice. Professor Laughlin is settled in his own fundamental opinions and positive in all of his deductions, and his writings are not always characterized by the most cautious and judicial balancing of two opposing economic theories, one of which conforms to his own prepossessions. In this discussion, moreover, he grapples with a number of controverted questions, on the answer to which economists who usually agree are now in open conflict. But the question at issue is always fairly put, and the fact that his own opinions are positively stated does not obscure the controversy.

What is said regarding the familiar "economic exhaustion" argument, for instance, is much to the present point. "Economic exhaustion is reached," the author tells us, "only when the surplus of production over the necessaries of life has been wiped out by turning the efforts of industry into making war supplies." Under this definition, it is obvious that no nation has yet reached absolute exhaustion; although Germany and Austria, for well-known reasons, are much nearer it than the others. Professor Laughlin warns against confusing economic exhaustion with financial exhaustion. "In the American Civil War, the Northern States were often financially bankrupt, yet their economic resources were not exhausted; the South yielded, not because of financial mismanagement, but because of economic exhaustion." The present case of Russia shows how easily the two conditions may be confused. Again, where does all the money come from to carry on this stupendous war? The answer is, that since the cost of war is largely represented by the destruction of goods, it is the quantity of goods demanded which forms the real economic expense. "Money remains; goods are destroyed; the war is really being carried on by credit."

The real problem is twofold: first, the disappearance of wealth, which is going on to a frightful extent and which reduces the margin from which savings can be made and from which capital is created; but second, the destruction of capital. Capital in the active production of peace times is constantly changing its form and being restored in new goods, through exchange of finished products with one another; whereas the goods sold to the Government for war purposes are destroyed without reproducing anything in their place. This, along with the loss in productive manpower, is the problem with which civilization is now confronted.

Professor Laughlin's review of the war-time financial operations of England and France follows for the most part familiar lines. In general, he pays a high tribute to the manner in which Great Britain has met the fiscal problem. The issue of "currency notes," however (which now exceeds $1,280,000,000), he regards as "in effect a forced loan to the state." England had two urgent problems, that of "commandeering" gold for the Government, and that of providing the people with currency in small denominations, by authorizing issue of £1 and 10-shilling notes by the Bank of England. To the extent that these notes are legal tender, Professor Laughlin's classification of them as a forced loan is indisputable. On the other hand, the notes were issued only to the banks, were supported by a gold reserve, and, by the terms of the act, are "treated as an advance by the Treasury" to a bank, "the security for the Treasury advance consisting of a floating charge on the assets of the bank, up to the amount of notes issued." It is not easy to classify such currency with exactness, but it is certainly not a "forced loan" of the familiar sort.

Yet "of the ability of the English to carry this colossal war debt," he thinks "there can be little doubt," as witness the payment of $2,500,000,000 annually in taxes. "If we are disposed to measure British credit or borrowing power by her ability to produce goods in the future, to hold her own in the competition of international markets, it must be clear that the exigencies of war have unmistakably awakened and stimulated her productive efficiency."

Professor Laughlin judges hopefully, though perhaps with greater reserve, the future of France. France, however, unlike England, has to deal hereafter with a suspension of specie payments, a depreciated war-time currency, and recourse to the Bank of France, to the amount of $3,750,000,000, for loans to carry on the war; these advances being directly responsible for the greater part of the $4,460,000,000 of war-time increase in the Bank's circulating notes. It is upon the proverbial thrift of the French middle classes that the author is inclined to base his hope for the nation's financial and economic future.

Special interest attaches to Professor Laughlin's analysis of the German economic situation, both because of its possible influence on the war itself, and because of the perplexity which has surrounded much of the Empire's achievement in war-time finance. In every discussion of these considerations, three questions arise. Is Germany's currency actually depreciated, and if so, how far is that due to an unsound inflation policy and how far to her economic isolation through the blockade? How has Germany managed to float her enormous war loans: by subscription of her people's actual wealth, or by a process of "pyramiding" on paper or credit? Finally, what is the country's real economic condition now, and what will it be after the war? Professor Laughlin's views on all three points are positive. The German currency, in his judgment, is heavily depreciated. As soon as specie payments were suspended, bank notes as compared with gold at once went to a discount in the shops. There was in fact, for a day or two, an actual old-fashioned "gold premium." This situation was met by prohibiting, under heavy penalty, the selling of currency at a discount; by virtual coercion of the people to give up their gold to the Reichsbank in exchange for notes, and by the establishment of maximum prices for goods. This left the foreign markets as the only place where currency depreciation could be measured. In Switzerland, Holland, and Denmark, it presently was so measured by a fall of 49 per cent. in the exchange value of the German mark.

How have the war loans, averaging of late some $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 a year, been floated? The German people "have incurred a war debt in three years which is more than one-third of the whole wealth of the country as estimated by Helfferich." How was this possible? One theory—that capital formerly engaged in foreign trade, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now released, is free to be loaned to the Government—Professor Laughlin rejects at once. It does not appear that such capital is transferable. "That employed in shipping is obviously locked up and earns nothing, and that used in producing articles for export, if not in fixed form, has probably been shifted to making war supplies." The fundamental elements in such subscription of wealth "must always be the production and sale of goods, by which all credit and all final liquidation of obligations, public or private, must be met." But in Germany such production and exchange, except for war supplies, "has undergone drastic reduction, while the credit obligations supposed to rest on this production have increased enormously. . . . It is impossible that there could be present liquidation if it were demanded; hence there can be no present solvency."

What, then, is the actual economic condition of Germany to-day, and what will it be when the war ends? Professor Laughlin evidently leans to the belief that Germany, by the strictest tests, is already insolvent. This belief he bases partly on the notorious fact that the Empire is paying a great part of the interest on earlier war loans from the proceeds of new ones; also on the statement of President Havenstein, of the Reichsbank, that the German people could carry no greater war debt than $25,000,000,000—which amount has already been exceeded. But Professor Laughlin does not conclude that Germany will be defeated by "economic exhaustion." He cites the case of the bankrupt railway, still operating in the hands of a receiver, and points out that Germany, "even if insolvent, can go on fighting so long as she can provide munitions and men, with the necessaries of life at least for the fighters." Germany's great political and financial blunder lay in the assumption by the Government that the war would be short, and would be ended with a huge indemnity imposed on a conquered foe, large enough to liquidate the expenses of the war. As things have turned out, the economic reckoning is postponed to the future. Germany's "ability to carry her staggering burden, therefore—if she does not repudiate—depends upon her power to produce in the future." This power Professor Laughlin does not deny to Germany. Recognizing "her characteristic persistence, thrift, organizing power, and industrial efficiency," he concedes the possibility that, under the spur of necessity, "in a surprisingly short time there would be as much capital in existence as before." But this will depend upon whether the German people hereafter "will support the war policy of their rulers," even in the face of a situation which should have brought them "to the point of denying themselves all habitual consumption, down to the minimum of existence."

Professor Laughlin's review of credit operations in the United States during the war is less comprehensive. He does not consider the special phenomena created by our own belligerency; he states, in fact, that his present study of the situation is closed "at the point before the United States has fairly entered the European war." This has excluded from the discussion such controverted questions as the proper ratio between war loans and war taxation in this country, or the action of the neutral exchanges on New York since April, 1917, or the actual influence (if any) on prices of the $1,576,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes issued since the American declaration of war, or the bearing of large Government borrowing on the conditions described by that very elastic word "inflation." As regards the inflation theory, however, one may fairly enough surmise what Professor Laughlin's view of 1918 would have been from what he writes of conditions at the time when the United States entered the war. The total circulating medium, even then, had increased nearly $1,300,000,000 since July, 1914; the rise of commodity prices in the same period had been notorious. The causes of the rise of prices in this country, however, Professor Laughlin finds in intense demand for labor, the consequent advance of wages, the unprecedented rise in ocean transportation rates, the shortened European crops and resultant bidding for American grain, and the abnormal European war demand for such products as coal, sugar, steel, and copper. "At best," such is his conclusion,

> it is only a one-sided theory which omits such powerful forces from consideration under an alibi usually termed "other things being equal." On this price question the "other things" have, like the whole body of the camel, pushed into the tent of the quantity theorists until they have occupied the whole space.

An Englishman in India

India and the Future. By William Archer. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $3 net.

THIS book has the merit of being candid, outspoken, and firm. The author has taken pains to study his subject and has not minced words to express his opinions and impressions. He is never in doubt, always sure of his conclusions, and positive in his opinions. His conclusions about existing political conditions in India are valuable, considering that he takes pains to point out more than once that he is not a "little Englander" and has no doubt of the British Empire being "one of the greatest and possibly one of the most beneficent facts of history"—considering also that his criticism of Indian Nationalists does not err on the side of leniency.

Mr. Archer sees no need of making any sort of apology in admitting that the "Indian Viceroy's Government, though subject to the control of the Parliament at Westminster, is absolutely autocratic in relation to the people of India"; that "the Briton comes to govern, governs, and goes away" without showing the least solicitude "to enter into the national life of the country" any more than "the plumber who puts in your waterpipe or the electrician who wires your house becomes a member of your family"; that in supposedly self-governed natives states the word of a British Resident, attached to each court, "is law in essential matters"; and that the European community of the Presidency towns, which he calls "European cities planted on Indian soil," "cares no more for the swarming millions around it than the dwellers of an island care for the fishes in the circumambient sea." It is little wonder, then, that the government of the country is marked by "its undisguised and systematic foreignness," the average British official doing little to mitigate "the crude fact of racial domination," which explains a great deal of the bitterness which sometimes characterizes the nationalist criticism of British rule in India.

Mr. Archer does well to remind the stay-at-home Britishers, as well as the world in general, that the "Indian races, take them all round, are not low but high races." They are "not black men as the Negro is black, but sunburnt white men. Color is an accident in India; in Africa and Afro-America it marks a radical difference." He pays a well-deserved tribute to the grace of the Indian women, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eventually sums up his conclusion on this point in the following words:

> The people of India stand high among the races of the world. They stand high in stature, proportion, power, dignity, delicacy, and—judged by the highest standards known to us—they often excel in beauty. Some of the noblest types of manhood I have ever seen were—or rather are—Indians.

On the much-debated question of the unity of India, Mr. Archer makes very significant remarks. In his judgment, "India's chief misfortune may be found to have lain *in the very fact of her indisputable unity*, coupled with her huge and unwieldy size." (The italics are ours.) In spite of caste, he adds, Hinduism is and will remain a "mighty bond of union."

But even more significant are his observations on the supposed differences of Hindus and Mahommedans, which are so "effectively" used by the British opponents of home rule for India. He does not think that these differences are so deep-rooted or so radical as to prevent the development of Indian self-government when the time is ripe for it. He recognizes that before the British

> established themselves in India, Mahommedan princes ruled over Hindu subjects, and Hindu princes over Mahommedan subjects, with very tolerable impartiality of rule or misrule. And the same is true in the native States of to-day, not merely as a result of British over-lordship. At no time, since the days of Aurangzib, has either religion seriously tried to overpower and cast out the other.

Mr. Archer does not find any evidence to justify the charge that the maxim of "Divide and Rule" has had any conscious play in British counsels. But he admits that

> England has in effect, though not in outward form, adopted the principle of "Divide and Rule," in her policy of maintaining nearly fourscore native States under her suzerainty.

Mr. Archer's defence of British policy is contained in the chapter called The Indian Opposition. Generally speaking, his arguments are repetitions of what the Imperial school has so often said and written. A comparison of the incidence of taxation in India with the rates prevailing in Western countries, without reference to the incomes of the two peoples, is fallacious. But, says Mr. Archer, the cost of defence need not depend upon the capacity to pay. Comparing the cost of defence in India with the cost incurred jointly by the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, he shows the huge disproportion between the two, forgetting that these countries of Western Europe do not maintain big armies for defence purposes only, but that, on the contrary, their ambitions are aggressive and imperialistic. It would have been more to the point if Mr. Archer had compared the military budget of India with the military budgets of Canada, Australia, and South Africa.

We do not mean to convey the idea that we are in full agreement with the criticisms of the Indian Nationalists against British rule in India. But we do not see any special strength in the arguments put forth by Mr. Archer, and this part of his book seems to us particularly weak, judged by democratic and liberal standards. It is pleasing, however, to observe that the dominant note of the book is the recognition of the principle that the right of self-government on democratic lines must be conceded to India in the course of time, the length of which must of course differ according to each party's judgment. The British are earnestly engaged at the present moment in formulating a scheme which should be a substantial advance towards the final goal of British rule in India, responsible government.

The rest of Mr. Archer's book is a sweeping denunciation of Hindu religion, Hindu manners, Hindu art, and Hindu civilization in general. There is a good deal in this criticism which may be just and true, but the strong language used, in a rather indiscriminate condemnation of everything Hindu, deprives it of all constructive value. Mr. Archer starts with a disclaimer of "passionate partisanship," but eventually succumbs to the same. Although he concedes that there is no reason for "pessimism" or "invective" and that "the brutally contemptuous attitude of the West to the East has had its day," yet one cannot help remarking that the greater part of his book is characterized by the same racial bluster and swagger which he had wanted to condemn. He even justifies "bad manners" by his half-hearted disapproval of them. "Bad manners are no longer good form," says he, as if they ever could be.

Hooverized Cook Books

The Chinese Cook Book. By Shiu Wong Chan. New York: F. A. Stokes Company. $1.50 net.

Eat to Live. By Sally Keene. Boston: Boylston Publishing Co. $1.10.

War-Time Breads and Cakes. By Amy L. Handy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 75 cents net.

Economy Cook Book. By Maria McIlvaine Gillmore. New York: E. P. Dutton Company. $1.

How to Cut Food Costs. By Lenna Frances Cooper. Battle Creek: Good Health Publishing Company.

Everyday Foods in War Time. By Mary Swartz Rose. New York: The Macmillan Company. 80 cents.

Caroline King's Cook Book. By Caroline B. King. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. $1.50 net.

Marketing and Housework Manual. By S. Agnes Donham. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. $1.50 net.

THE Chinese have a pleasant way of claiming, whenever we boast of an important discovery, that they knew all about it some five thousand years ago. They certainly were good cooks and epicures long before any Europeans. While our historians point with pride to the invention of knives and forks several centuries ago, the Chinese tell us frankly they discarded these barbarous metal implements long before that time, having found that they impaired the delicate flavor of some foods. A few years ago Dr. Wiley predicted that in the near future we should use meats chiefly as condiments, to flavor vegetables and cereals. Did he know that was the doctrine of Confucius? Perhaps the most striking evidence of Chinese anticipation of things modern is their habit of eating beans, peas, and other dried vegetables, as well as cereals, after they have been covered two days with a wet cloth and have developed sprouts an inch or two in length. These sprouts, they claim, are palatable and nutritious. Now it happens that the latest discovery of our food chemists is that the very important ingredients of a nutritious diet known as vitamines are lost if dried peas and beans are cooked in the ordinary way, but saved if these legumes are allowed to sprout. Chop suey restaurants abound in our cities; and now there is a Chinese cook book which betrays the secrets of the Celestial cuisine. It is by Shiu Wong Chan, who gives minute directions for preparing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dishes of rare delicacy and flavor. Many of them can be made of raw material available in any kitchen; others require Oriental specialties, which can be obtained at Chinese stores, the addresses of which are given.

It is timely, too, for the Chinese way of using meat as a condiment favors Hooverism, as does the use of peanut oil for cooking in place of butter. Still, on the whole, this is not an economy cook book. The "primary soup," which enters into many of these dishes, calls for plenty of pork and chicken. For special war-time cook books we must look to our American experts, who are coming forward *en masse* to serve their country in this way. "As our men are being scientifically trained that not one shot be wasted, so must our women be scientifically trained that not one ounce of food be wasted," is a sentence from the Dedication of Sally Keene's "Eat to Live"; and the same Hooverish words might have been used as motto in four other books on our list. Sally Keene tells us why we eat, how much to eat, and how to eat, and she does it with such telegraphic conciseness that she needs only forty-seven pages to impart a great deal of helpful information. In sixty-six pages Amy L. Handy tells about "War-Time Breads and Cakes." All of her receipts are economical, and none calls for wheat flour. The variety of breads that can be made without that cereal is surprising, and it is for each family to experiment and discover its favorite substitutes.

Somewhat more elaborate are the other books, which include all classes of foods. Maria McIlvaine Gillmore's "Economy Cook Book" is "designed to take the place among recipe books that the Ford does among automobiles." It is simple, practical, economical in its recipes, and the suggested menus are scientifically balanced. In the chapter on meat substitutes, cheese, eggs, fish, and legumes loom up large. Cottage cheese is considered so important that it has a chapter to itself.

"How to Cut Food Costs," while it perhaps features unduly the doctrine of calories, embodies many valuable experiences of Lenna Frances Cooper, former head dietitian of that huge laboratory known as the Battle Creek Sanitarium. It is a book to be commended particularly to those of limited means. The smaller the income, the higher is the percentage spent on food, wherefore the author's directions as to how one-fourth to one-third of the food cost can be saved by following modern methods and indulging in the "balanced ration" are worth following.

The problem of how one can be patriotic as well as economic in these trying days is also fully discussed in "Everyday Foods in War Time," by Mary Swartz Rose, of Teachers College, Columbia University. She preaches the gospel of milk, cereals, and green vegetables, and has a suggestive answer to the question: "Are fruits and vegetables luxuries?" Next on our list is Caroline King, who has instructed the chefs of many Western hotels in "Hoover cooking." Her book differs from many others in having fewer recipes and more elementary instruction for novices, for which, no doubt, they will be grateful.

The best cook is foiled if her raw material is of inferior quality. The culinary art must be supplemented by a knowledge of the art of selecting meats, vegetables, and fruits. S. Agnes Donham's "Marketing and Household Manual," an admirable guide along these lines, should be in every home. It provides a great deal of condensed information regarding all household matters, and is worth its weight in gold to every housekeeper.

The Law of Waiver

Waiver Distributed. By John S. Ewart. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

IN an article in a law magazine which appeared a year before the publication of this book the author wrote:

> I have prepared for the press a dissertation with the title, "Waiver Distributed into Election, Estoppel, Contract, and Release," but four publishing firms have declined it. It is said to be "highly meritorious," and so on, but is only 350 pages; and a small book is as bothersome as one yielding larger returns. The encyclopædias and stenographers are rapidly depriving lawyers of any claim to be members of one of the learned professions.

A careful study of the book leads one to doubt whether the publishers were quite frank with the author. Their declinations, couched in conventionally courteous terms, may have been based on the conviction that the work was one which they did not care to vouch for. They may have laid down the manuscript, as most readers will lay down the book, with astonishment at the blunders here ascribed to judges and text-writers during the last century and a half. They may have been familiar with the author's claim, put forward in 1912, half playfully, perhaps, that his argument "ought to have the effect of revolutionizing the law in the United States with reference to waiver in insurance cases"; and they may have deemed the claim quixotic. Indeed, the author in the article last referred to, speaks of his argument, which in outline had been before the public for seven years, as having "had no effect of any kind"; and in the book he maintains that it has influenced judicial decisions in only one state, Indiana, and there but temporarily (p. 21).

However, failure to achieve revolution works no abatement in Mr. Ewart's zeal and courage. Like Disraeli, he is at his best when "fighting with the energy of despair." It is highly probable that he would have been more successful in his attempt to improve the law if he had confined his efforts to the correction of abuses in the employment of "waiver," and had not undertaken the task of eliminating the term altogether from legal parlance.

Mr. Ewart declares that "nobody knows what 'waiver' is" (p. 201). Well, judges have thought they knew. As early as 1310 (in Horbling vs. Aurrel, 3 Ed. II, 184), the court held that by demanding a view of the tenements the tenant affirmed the writ good, and he was not allowed thereafter to question the form of the writ. The term waiver is not found in the original Year Book, but the English translator's headnote properly declares that the tenant "waived" pleas to the form of the writ by demanding a view of the tenements. This doctrine was applied to all pleas in abatement. If an action was brought against one of several partners, or one of several executors, or by one of several joint tenants, and the defendant pleaded to the issue, he thereby lost the advantage which he might have had but for pleading." That is, he waived his plea in abatement. (See Boston vs. Samford, Carth. 60, 61, A.D. 1690.) "Waiver" of estates, also, is discussed with much fulness in Butler and Baker's case (3 Coke 26, A. D. 1592).

That the term "waiver" has been subject to abuse is clearly shown by Mr. Ewart. It has become a sort of legal chameleon, taking on hues of meaning as various as the connections in which it is found. Mr. Ewart has rendered a valuable service in disentangling it from some of its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mesalliances, and clearing up the confusion which has resulted from its improper use, especially in insurance law. But he has not been content with this. The term seems to have much the same effect upon him that Carthage had upon the elder Cato. Every discussion must close with a "*delenda est.*" The title of the book should be not "Waiver Distributed," but "Waiver Destroyed."

Such being the character of the book, Dean Pound's "Foreword" appears not to hit the mark. It is redolent of wide reading, but has little relevancy to the text. Undoubtedly, Ihering's characterization of the sanctity accorded to the words of legal formulæ in primitive law is quite accurate and quite worth repeating. But Mr. Ewart never intimates that waiver is a term of primitive law, or that the evils resulting from its abuse have come down from a period of "immature mental development." Nor does he suggest that it is at all akin to William James's "illuminating or power-bringing names."

The Story of Hampton

Education for Life: The Story of Hampton Institute. By Francis Greenwood Peabody. New York. Doubleday, Page & Co. $2.50.

UNDER a thoroughly misleading title we have here a book which comprises not only a history of Hampton Institute but definitive biographies of the two great educators, General Samuel Chapman Armstrong and Dr. Hollis B. Frissell, whose lives are indissolubly connected with this great school. Were it not that the problem of two races itself in the final analysis shaped Hampton's development, one could say that Armstrong and Frissell were Hampton, as Louis XIV insisted that he was the State. The genius and vision of Armstrong, of course, saw the opportunity and the need; he brought from his Hawaiian home knowledge of a small school which became in his mind the germ of Hampton when the close of the Civil War found this patriot and scholar ready to lay down arms but unwilling to give up the battle for the emancipated race.

As one looks back upon it the refusal of the Federal Government at that time to concern itself seriously with the colored men who were but chattels the day before, is one of the great tragedies of our history. In 1865 reconstruction meant political reconstruction. Social reconstruction, and economic in large degree, were left to take care of themselves; the reconstruction of the individual of which we hear so much to-day no one really dreamed of in the sixties. It was enough that the Freedman's Aid Bureau did something; but when the surface of the need had been bravely scratched the Bureau was abandoned. From the point of view of education the Negro was turned adrift and forgotten. What a clear-cut Federal policy of thoroughgoing education for citizenship of the Negro would have meant for the South and the North nobody can over-estimate. But with statesmanship lacking in Washington, it was left to a few noble pioneers like Armstrong to fashion the torch and then to keep it alight.

A noble and glorious work it has been and noble have been its fruits. For the manual training given at Hampton to the despised freedman may truly be said to have been the precursor of trade and vocational training throughout the nation. It gave, moreover, immediate hope for a solution of the race problem to hundreds of thousands who had seen no solution, not having Armstrong's never failing faith. "This faith," he once said, "rests upon our absolute certainty of the capacity of these people for improvement and our conviction that their progress is only a question of time and effort." More than that, the General saw, as Dr. Peabody puts it, that the education offered "must be won rather than given, and based on faith in labor as a moral force; it must inspire the will to serve rather than the will to get; it must be a struggle not for life alone but for the lives of others." This was Armstrong's idealism which the saintly Dr. Frissell upheld; it has been as valuable a gift to the country as Hampton itself has been to the Negro race, and Hampton's imitators are now numbered by hundreds.

Many pages could be written contrasting the lives of Armstrong and Frissell. The one worked himself to a premature end in fiery missionary pioneering. When his successor took hold it was no longer necessary invariably to prove Hampton right and its philosophy genuine. So under Dr. Frissell came the great physical and material expansion of the plant; he literally frayed himself out and gave his life in that terrible struggle to meet an ever-increasing annual deficit—for to stand still would have been death. A most truly religious and self-sacrificing man, he was for his time an ideal leader of Hampton, but those colored people who have attained the widest vision frequently deplored Dr. Frissell's silence in the face of much sin against the Negro race. Yet he never ceased to work quietly, if indirectly, to alter these evil conditions. "You," he wrote to a friend in the North, "have the priceless privilege of speaking out. We here must keep silent for Hampton, but we know how to honor and appreciate what you are doing."

Today thoughtful people, both colored and white, are still troubled about Hampton. They feel that the Negroes themselves should have greater representation on its board, on which has sat but one colored man, the present principal of Tuskegee; and a feeling of distrust causes much uneasiness lest Hampton throw its influence in the direction of compelling the Negro to a permanent position as hewer of wood and drawer of water. Perhaps it will be the privilege of the new principal, James Edgar Gregg, to distinguish the third epoch of Hampton by ending these questionings.

Meanwhile the past is secure; Hampton is one of the greatest assets of America, a jewel of which the nation ought ever to be proud. The volume before us is admirably put together. Its statistics and records are complete and the spirit of the place is perfectly set forth. It includes, of course, an excellent sketch of Hampton's work for the Indian. Dr. Peabody has made a worthy contribution to the semi-centennial of Hampton, which the Institute, albeit militarized, is now celebrating.

Two Portraits

Camilla. By Elizabeth Robins. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.

My Antonia. By Willa Sibert Cather. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

THOUGH it was written in war-time England, Miss Robins's story of "the calm Camilla" has nothing to do with the war. Camilla is an embodiment of that Eternal Feminine who so easily, in spite of trumpets and demonstrations, holds her own against the Everlasting Female. Her story begins here, very effectively, in the middle. We find her a woman six years divorced and vaguely at home in London. She has riches and a fine town house, and a social position which is the result of an acquaintance oddly begun in Switzerland. Traveling through the Engadine, alone with her "courier-maid," Camilla Trenholme has found a point of human interest in the spectacle of a devoted middle-aged English couple, has innocently pursued them for the pleasure of watching their happiness, and has assisted at a strange scene which has set their relation in a new light. They are lovers, it seems, and the lady's brother arrives to whisk them off because the lady's husband is in the neighborhood! Alice St. Amant of the staid British Nancarrows, mother of grown daughters, has been for years the furtive mistress of a Lord Scarborough. Her husband knows, her mother knows, everybody knows, but since there has been no open break, the conventions are understood to be appeased if not satisfied. Perhaps it is a part of Camilla's "calm" that this situation puzzles more than it offends her. Alice St. Amant, at all events, is to be her intimate friend and her social sponsor in London. Though Camilla has been about Europe for five or six years, and is known to polite society in Paris, Florence, and elsewhere, and is without guile, both Alice and her brother Michael take her to be a widow until, after her engagement to Michael, chance discovers her to be a divorcée. Then there is trouble at Nancarrow, the old English estate where Camilla is visiting. From the old mother down, all consider Camilla to be unfit for an alliance with the family which is able to hold its head up over Alice and her affair with Scarborough. Michael excepted—for he will have her whether or no, and being the head of the family can impose

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his will even on the ancient dragon his mother. The Nancarrows do not go half way: she is taken to the family bosom; but then comes her own revolt. Michael is all that she likes and admires, yet something in her resists. Though her American husband Leroy Trenholme has been altogether at fault and they have been so long apart, she feels that she still "belongs to him, and therefore cannot belong to Michael." She begs for time and returns to America where (to put the whole thing briefly) she sees Leroy, aging and unhappy, is ready to be his wife again; and finds him wishing for something much less than that. As we part with her, she is setting out alone for her old childhood home in Florida, leaving behind in New York not only the Leroy who has paid her the last insult, but the Michael who, knowing all, still hopes. The story ends upon a human note of uncertainty. Is the old link finally broken, and the way open for the safety that is offered by steadfast Michael? We do not know, but we feel that whatever her decision in the future, Camilla's "calmness," her little clear taper of indomitable character, will see her on her way. Oddly enough, it is by irrelevant details such as Camilla's stupidity, after many years abroad, about English speech and customs, that her portrait is blurred. It is a curious lapse.

Miss Robins affects the deliberate, elliptical, smooth-spoken post-Jacobite manner that appears to attract so many of the current women story-tellers, Mrs. Wharton leading the way. It touches snobbishness at both ends. It is too niggling and high-heeled for much real usefulness on this side of the water. A writer like Miss Cather is as clear of it as of the man-in-the-street patter of the magazine story-tellers (snobbishness at its nadir). Her style has distinction, not manner; and it is the style of an artist whose imagination is at home in her own land, among her own people, which happens to be a democratic land and a plain people. She has a strong feeling about this—that we cannot get away from our sources. One recalls how this is enforced in "The Song of the Lark"—how we were made to understand that Thea Kronborg's genius sprang from the soil of her birthplace. And one recognizes how directly this story, like "The Song of the Lark," springs from Miss Cather's own soil. She was born in Virginia, but her childhood was passed on her father's ranch in Nebraska. During her most receptive years her nature was responding to the charm and mystery of the prairie, and also to her human setting. The pioneer neighborhood was mainly peopled by Scandinavians and Bohemians. Their exotic character and ways became a part of the child's America. Her three novels are stories of women: two of them Swedish-American girls, and the third, Ántonia, the child of a Bohemian immigrant. This is and professes to be (despite the publishers who inconceivably declare it "a love-story") nothing more or less than a portrait of a woman. The Shimerdas are a poor Bohemian family who have taken up a little Nebraskan farm. The father, a man of sensitive feeling, devoted to his own land, has come to America at the insistence of the vulgar and ambitious mother. He finds nothing to live for here, and takes his own life not long after their arrival. The girl Ántonia has his fineness of nature but a vigor and steadfastness also, of body and spirit, which fit her for conquest of life. Not in Thea Kronborg's way, by genius infallibly journeying upward, but by the commoner road of a strong and simple character not to be submerged by circumstance. We do not so much hear her story told as go with her upon her humble triumphant way, as farm-hand, hired girl, woman befooled and deserted by the father of her first child, and at last as happy wife and drudge of a commonplace good little man of her own race, and mother of a great brood of healthy and rewarding offspring. Our guide upon this quiet pilgrimage is the American who has been Ántonia's neighbor and playmate in childhood, and whose love for her, in his years of "success" in the great world, remains a feeling of peculiar depth and unlessening inspiration. In some sense, after all that has come between them, she is still "his Ántonia." "She was a battered woman now, not a lovely girl; but she still had that something which fires the imagination, could still stop one's breath for a moment by a look or gesture that somehow revealed the meaning in common things. . . . It was no wonder that her sons stood tall and straight. She was a rich mine of life, like the founders of early races." A notable portrait, rendered too quietly, perhaps, to catch the eye of the seeker for color and movement of the picturesque or dramatic order, but worthy to stand with "The Song of the Lark" among the best of our recent interpretations of American life.

Notes

STOKES AND COMPANY will publish in November: "Biltmore Oswald: The Diary of a Hapless Recruit," by J. Thorne Smith; and "Handicraft for Boys," by A. Frederick Collins.

E. P. Dutton and Company announce for early publication: "The Life of St. Francis Xavier, Evangelist, Explorer, Mystic," by Edith Anne Stewart; "We Others," by Henri Barbusse; "Getting Together with Latin America," by A. Hyatt Verrill; "The Library of French Fiction," by Barnet J. Beyer.

Within a few weeks D. Appleton and Company will publish "Fighters Young Americans Want to Know," by Everett Tomlinson.

John Lane and Company have ready for immediate publication: "Roumania Yesterday and To-day," by Mrs. Will Gordon; "Asia Minor," by Walter A. Hawley; "The Memoirs of Sir Andrew Melville, 1620-1672," by Torick Ameer-Ali; "If We Return," by C. B. Manwaring; "Women and Soldiers," by Mrs. Alec Tweedle; "The Greater Patriotism," by John Lewis Griffiths; "Famous Pictures of Real Animals," by Lorinda M. Bryant; "The Laws of Chance," by F. E. Mills Young; "Footsteps," by Dorothy Percival; "His Grace of Grub Street," by G. V. McFadden.

Among J. B. Lippincott Company's early Christmas juveniles are: "Introduction to Science for Little People," by Charles D. Lewis; "The Waterboys and Their Cousins;" "Gulliver's Travels;" "A School Camp Fire," by Elsie Oxenham; "The Fairy Godmother," by L. T. Meade; "Miss Peter," by May Baldwin; "Hans Andersen's Fairy Tales," by William Woodburn; "Stories of Savage Life," by G. F. Scott Elliot; "By Eskimo Dog-Sled and Kayak," S. K. Hutton.

WHEN we have completed the two generous volumes of "My Reminiscences" (Holt; $7.50), by Raphael Pumpelly, we still feel that we are not well acquainted with the author. It is not he who survives in our mind, but a remarkable series of word pictures of conditions and times which have changed and gone forever. As an autobiography the book is lacking; as a record of world conditions of almost two generations gone, it is unique, and after all this is the keenest praise which could be given to such a work. The author's adventures in Corsica alone, if elaborated, would make a volume. He gives a new light on the sturdy natives of this island, and the humor which leavens all the chapters comes out in the account of the live mouflon which he tamed, and which broke all the mirrors in his hotels. The first volume deals largely with Professor Pumpelly's early travels in the American West and his trans-Pacific voyage to undertake geological work for the Japanese Government. Here we get interesting observations on Japan as it was at the beginning of our Civil War, together with an account of his visit to China and the crossing of Siberia in winter. The second volume deals chiefly with the author's more mature life as a mining expert in the Rocky Mountains, Mexico and Wisconsin, and gives the record of two expeditions to locate the supposed Central Asiatic home of our race. Appendices, colored plates, and photographs add to the excellent presswork put upon this life record, which will take its place, perhaps, with the records of Audubon and Agassiz, as an extremely interesting contribution to our knowledge of early times.

THE subjects of Miss Winifred Kirkland's essays are excellent for her purpose: "The Joys of Being a Woman" (Houghton Mifflin; $1.50 net), which gives the title to her book; "A Man in the House," though we rather fancied that was a matter settled once and for all at Cranford; "The Woman Who Writes," "Letters and Letter-Writing," "The Tendency to Testify," and as many more in the same vein. Miss Kirkland has ideas and she sees life with humor; but, as she says herself, "the essay is no easy thing." It is not sufficient for it to reveal personality, which she suggests as its chief end. The revelation must be made with charm, above all with grace of language. In no form of literature is what we call style so essential. Miss Kirkland's humor needs a touch of lightness. She seems self-conscious, even if she is not—as if she were thrusting her ideas upon us and then standing by to ask, "Now what do you think of them?" We might be ready to accept this challenge were it not for the foreword; the reference to Elia sets an impossible standard, and the author is lost.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHEN "A Woman of No Importance" published her "Memories Discreet and Indiscreet" the one fault the critics found—or so the publishers say in their advertisement—was that there were not enough indiscretions. The result, naturally, is a second volume, "Further Indiscretions" (Dutton; $5 net). The reader who is led by the title to look for reckless revelations or shocking scandals, will be disappointed. The book is made up of light rambling gossip, seldom enlivened by malice, seldom even verging on the indecorous. It is gossip, moreover, rather narrow in range. "A Woman of No Importance" evidently graces the sporting set in England and most of her sporting chatter has little more than a local interest, while the notorieties who figure in it—Mrs. Langtry, the Marquis of Hastings, the Duchess of Montrose, the Jubilee Plunger, to mention a few of the most notorious—and their doings seem sadly trivial in these tragic days.

THE prospect of a new book by G. A. Birmingham makes one hasten through the day's work to stretch one's feet the sooner to the fire (if there be a fire!) for an evening of chuckles. One anticipates incredible situations and irresistible Irishry. But "The Island of Mystery" (Doran; $1.50) lies in seas too remote from Ireland. Undoubtedly it would be only in the Ægean sea that an American millionaire could pick up a second-hand kingdom for cash when his daughter had a fancy for playing queen; and where else would the Emperor have concealed his submarine petrol base than in the caves of the island of Salissa? International complications are bound to ensue, to the satisfaction of Sir Bartholomew Bland-Potterton, diplomat, and Gorman, M. P. for Upper Offaly, but to the frequent inconvenience of the spendthrift König Konrad Karl of Megalia, and the excitable Madame Ypsilante, who shares his palace but not his throne. The indispensable Smith does a perfect servant's part in furthering the complications. And all the puppets dance when the wires are pulled by the unseen but ever-felt Emperor. Yet with all this mirth-provoking matter, it seems a waste for Mr. Birmingham to be doing imaginary Germans, Megalians, and Americans when he might be giving us true Irish. The Americans suffer particularly at his hands, though given a generous allowance of highballs. The young Queen-by-right-of-purchase has been to a middle-western university where "emasculated philosophy and a kind of intellectual complexion cream called literature had been smeared all over her by earnest professors." How came she, then, to address her servants by so British an expression as "you nasty beasts!"?

IN "The Crime" (Doran; $2.50 net), the author of "J'Accuse" reëxamines after Stowell, Beck, Headlam, and others, the diplomatic documents published at the outbreak of the war and also the important ones which have appeared since then. In addition he takes cognizance of a great deal of interesting controversial literature pertinent to the subject. But a critic finds difficulty in estimating the value of the work, not only because the authorship is not yet revealed, but because it is written in a manner egotistical, controversial, and disputatious. There is able analysis and striking disquisition, but in examining doubtful matter and determining difficult things it is not an advantage to encounter the exceeding vehemence of very strong feeling instead of calm, judicial survey. But when once allowance is made for this, one finds good historical knowledge of the events which led to the war and abundant corroboration of the author's thesis, that Germany and Austria were directly responsible for the war.

THE dissertation entitled "General von Bissing's Testament: A Study in German Ideals" (T. Fisher Unwin) contains not the smallest idea that there ought to be consideration for anything except what will make Germany strong and great, not the slightest feeling of chivalry or mercy or fine sentiment or fair play. Von Bissing says there will surely be another great war in the future, with a powerful combination against the Fatherland even as now, and Germany must be made strong to meet it. There must be naval bases for sea-power on the Belgian coast, to make England acknowledge Germany as an equal in the world; Germany must have the Belgian coal deposits, factories, and port trade to strengthen the Empire at the expense of her foes. "Possibly," says von Bissing in a letter, "the world never has seen and never will see again an instance of a conqueror being so greatly strengthened by his conquests as we should be by winning Belgium." After the annexation there must be no half-measures, no weakness, no "vacillating policy of conciliation which was so disadvantageous not only in Alsace-Lorraine, but also in Poland." Walloons and Flemings, if they stay, must declare allegiance to Germanism; otherwise let them go, and let expropriation do its work thoroughly. All this was written, we remember, when the hand of death was reaching out and almost lay upon the author, and long before the days of Foch's offensive.

BOTH Secretary Lane, in "The American Spirit" (Stokes; 75 cents net), and Secretary Baker, in "Frontiers of Freedom" (Doran; $1.75 net), remind us in an interesting way of the wide variety and yet of the essential unity of this republic. Secretary Lane, hailing from the far West, admires the adventurous, self-reliant spirit of the American pioneer. He does not say with Emerson that America is another word for opportunity. What he is chiefly concerned with is the coöperation which goes with equality: "The extent to which a people can coöperate marks the point of civilization which they have reached." With the courage of this conviction he tells the coal-producers that they must live not for to-day or themselves, but for the people of the United States; indeed, for all the people of the earth. The conviction is not a mere creed with him. He is inducing farmers, big and little, to coöperate in vast reclamation projects. Looking to the end of the war, he has devised a plan for assisting the returning soldiers to fit into the national life. He looks forward at times to a larger coöperation, when not only Mexico and the United States shall live as neighbors, but the wide world shall be governed by this American spirit.

AS an executive Secretary Baker's interests have been centered on social conditions. It is significant that our Secretary of War spends little thought on self-government. He, too, thinks of democracy as equality, but finds as a large element of its meaning equality of opportunity. It is a hopeful day in American politics when a member of the Cabinet, and that, too, a Secretary of War, can declare: "We have discovered that if it be the fate of any group in society to have learned to neglect the welfare of its workers, that group is doomed to decay, disintegration and dissolution, because this fact has been brought home to the people—that the welfare of a nation depends not upon the number of its rich men nor the number of its wise men, nor the quantity of wisdom or richness, but it depends upon the plane upon which the great mass of mankind lives. If that be elevated a point, there come into the life of the worker sweetness, recreation, and repose. If the door of opportunity is open to the children of the worker, there is predestined continuous progress and success." These voices of the Administration show that this generation is replacing the heroic watchwords, "liberty and union," with the humanitarian ideals of coöperation and equality of opportunity.

IN a series of intimate letters to American friends ("An Englishwoman's Home," Doran; $1.35 net), Mrs. A. Burnett Smith (whose books signed "Annie S. Swan" have for a generation been devoured by the young people of Great Britain) tells of the wrecking of her peaceful English home by a Zeppelin raid. Few of us have clearly visualized the actual misery in England and its gradual intensification. Mrs. Smith, who has recently been in this country, at the suggestion of the Foreign Office, telling the inspiring story of English women's war work, finds that one of the worst of the "dark fruits of war" is "the tempering and hardening of a naturally kindly people into a thirst for revenge." Yet despite the strain on body and soul alike, she still believes of her countrymen: "We are not successful haters; we are only clean fighters and desperate lovers of peace."

THE spirit of the good old days when neighbors shared in husking bees, harvesting, and "raising," should be extended to our modern complex municipalities, according to Professor Liberty H. Bailey. His "Universal Service, the Hope of Humanity" (Sturgis and Walton; $1.25) urges us to get rid of the spirit of enmity, which can be eliminated only through persistent and cumulative education. Mr. Bailey would have all service definitely for the public good, with physical training without militarism, and coöperation in every move for the benefit of a neighborhood or the support of the government.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Music

Lecocq is Dead

LECOCQ is dead! How strange these words will sound in most ears! For was not Lecocq—Alexander Charles Lecocq—born as long ago as 1832, only thirteen years before his contemporary, rival and prototype Offenbach, who died in 1880; and did he not end his career with "La Belle au Bois Dormant," twenty-eight years ago? For nearly three decades he has lived in comparative obscurity, few of his numerous light operas having survived his creative activity.

No opera composer, unless he is of the first rank and neglected at first, should be so foolish as to live eighty-six years unless he is indifferent to oblivion before death. To be sure, M. Lecocq shared one experience with the truly great ones; though predestined for a stage career, he found it difficult to make a start. Considering that he was fated to be an amusement-maker for the masses, the most critical episode in his career is almost as comic as one of his operetta plots. In 1856 Offenbach, the Prussian Jew who was so long the idol of the Parisians, opened a competition for an operetta, "Le Docteur Miracle." Bizet was also in the race, and these two won over sixty-two competitors, their scores being staged on successive days in April, 1857. Lecocq's effort was well spoken of by the critics. Its success, however, was not great enough to commend him to the managers; whereupon he took to teaching for a living and also published a collection of sacred songs for women's voices entitled "La Chapelle au Couvent." This did not indicate that in his mind ecclesiastic and musical impulses were naturally commingled, as in the souls of Gounod and Massenet; it was simply an outcome of his activity as a church organist.

The call of the stage proved irresistible, and he felt so sure of ultimate success that he ignored six more failures. At last, in 1868, eleven years after his first effort, he won a real success; his "Fleur de Thé" was not only repeated more than a hundred times in Paris, but found its way to foreign cities. No fewer than nine works followed during the next four years, and the ninth of them was an operetta which carried Lecocq's fame to all parts of the world as a popular favorite not second even to Offenbach himself. It was "La Fille de Mme. Angot"—who has not heard of "La Fille de Mme. Angot," even if he has not seen and heard it? In Brussels, where it had its première, it ran five hundred nights consecutively. Like a prairie fire it spread over two continents and beyond. To this day, when there is talk of a Lecocq revival, this amusing and tuneful work is sure to be one of the two chosen. The other is as sure to be "Giroflé-Girofla," which was launched in 1874 and was first heard in New York at the Park Theatre the following year.

None of his other titles—the total number reaches nearly half a hundred—became so well known, but not a few of them had a great temporary vogue. Apart from his light operas, his output was of no special significance. It is worth noting, however, that he was a good performer on the piano and composed for this instrument two dozen "character-pieces" ("Les Miettes") besides some songs, and the ecclesiastic pieces already referred to; worth noting, because it calls attention to the fact that he was not merely a fountain of facile, popular tunes, but a trained musician; in which respect he was ahead of Offenbach or Hervé, the two originators of modern operetta. As a student he had won first prizes at the Paris Conservatoire, after studying fugue and composition with Halévy and organ with Benoist. This musicianship betrays itself in his operatic scores and justifies Arthur Pougin's opinion that Lecocq should be regarded less as a successor of Offenbach than of Adam, Boieldieu, Auber and other masters of the genuine *comédie musicale*.

HENRY T. FINCK

Amusements

"Everything" "Is the biggest thing ever."—*Journal*, and at the lowest prices. AT THE
Mat. To-day Best Seats $1 Evenings at 8:15 HIPPODROME

Finance

Helping the Railroads

THE railroads are showing materially increased earnings in consequence of the larger revenues from higher passenger and freight rates which became effective towards the close of June. The August earnings just given out by the Interstate Commerce Commission disclose an increase of $136,000,000 in operating revenues over those of a year ago. At the same time, however, expenses went up $112,000,000, suggesting the heavy burden to which the carriers will be exposed in meeting the enormously enlarged payroll requirements of the coming year.

The probability is, however, that the railroads will be able to save a considerable margin, if wages are not further advanced. This is indicated by the heavy freight revenues of August, which aggregated $349,816,000, as against $250,781,000 in the same month of 1917. Passenger revenues in the same month amounted to $113,651,000, this being an increase of $31,729,000 as compared with a year ago. The transportation system is showing increased efficiency under the government method of operating all railroads as one great system. A noteworthy development has been the reduction of 57 per cent. in the accumulation of export freight at Atlantic ports between December and October. A survey just made shows that while last December 44,320 car-loads of export freight were piled up on the piers of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Newport News, and Norfolk, of which 12,552 loads had not been unloaded from the cars, the congestion at the beginning of this month had been reduced to 18,796 car-loads, of which only 5,383 loads were on wheels.

This improvement means much when the hardships of last winter's freight blockade are taken into account. Traffic was paralyzed for weeks; the congestion became so acute that the Pennsylvania in desperation hired men to go with the freight sent by the road, in order to prevent, if possible, the shifting of the cars to "dead tracks." When the blockade was at its height it often took two or three weeks to send freight two or three hundred miles. The large roads were compelled to announce embargoes, so that it was impossible for shippers at near-by points to send freight to New York. Because of the severity of the winter and the difficulty of maintaining train schedules, the nation's delivery system was tied up just at the season when quick service was most needed. Conditions became intolerable.

With the taking over of the railroads by the Goverment, however, an earnest effort was made to expedite the delivery of export freight and to relieve the congestion at terminal centers. These efforts have been highly successful; there is little doubt that the country will be spared this winter the hardships incident to a general congestion of export and domestic traffic. If this be avoided there need be little fear of a coal famine, since the quick movement of fuel from the mining sections will insure an adequate supply at the centres of chief consumption.

WILLIAM JUSTUS BOIES

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION

Bierce, Ambrose. Can Such Things Be? Boni, Liveright. $1.50.
Bower, B. M. Skyrider. Little, Brown. $1.40.
Caldwell, W. W. Donald McElroy, Scotch-Irishman. Jacobs. $1.35.
Cullum, Ridgwell. The Triumph of John Kars. Jacobs. $1.40.
Davis, J. F. Almanzar. Holt. $1.
Delafield, E. M. The War-Workers. Knopf. $1.50.
Gray, Maxwell. The Black Opal. Appleton. $1.50.
Hill, Francis. Once on the Summer Range. Macmillan. $1.50.
Philpotts, Eden. The Spinners. Macmillan. $1.60.
Sanborn, Gertrude. Blithesome Jottings. Four Seas. $1.25.
Van Schaick, George. The Peace of Roaring River. Small, Maynard. $1.50.
Waller, Mary E. Out of the Silences. Little, Brown. $1.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATURAL SCIENCE

Aitken, R. G. The Binary Stars. McMurtrie.
Hall, H. J. War-Time Nerves. Houghton Mifflin. $1.

SOCIAL SCIENCE

Cohen, J. H. Commercial Arbitration and the Law. Appleton. $3.
Hollister, H. A. The Woman Citizen. Appleton. $1.75.
Jones, H. W. Safe and Unsafe Democracy. Crowell. $2.
Lincoln, E. E. The Results of Municipal Electric Lighting in Massachusetts. Houghton Mifflin. $3.
Peters, C. C. Human Conduct. Macmillan. $1.50.
Popenoe, Paul, and Johnson, R. H. Applied Eugenics. Macmillan. $2.10.
Rodrigues, Gustave. The People of Action. Scribners. $1.50.
Tufts, J. H. The Ethics of Coöperation. Houghton Mifflin. $1.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Abbott, H. P. A. The Religion of the Tommy. Morehouse Publishing Co. $1.
Abbott, Lyman. The Twentieth Century Crusade. Macmillan. 60 cents.
Ames, S. The New Orthodoxy. University of Chicago Press. $1.
Jones, R. M. The World Within. Macmillan. $1.25.
Mathews, Shailer. Patriotism and Religion. Macmillan. $1.25.
Michael, O. S. The Sunday-School. The Young Churchman Co. 50 cents.
Purdy, A. C. The Way of Christ. The Woman's Press. 75 cents.
Rowell, W. D. Patriotism and the Christian Life. The Woman's Press.
Sciens. How to Speak with the Dead. Dutton. $1.50.
Smith, N. K. A Commentary to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. Macmillan. $6.
Starr, Frederick. Korean Buddhism. Marshall Jones. $2.
Ward, H. F. The Gospel for a Working World. Missionary Education Movement.

THE WAR

Allen, W. H., and Kleiser, Clare. Stories of Americans in the World War. Institute for Public Service.
Bagnold, Enid. A Diary Without Date. Luce.
Brooks, Major Harlow. Do's and Don'ts for New Soldiers. Macmillan. $1.
Bryant, Louise. Six Red Months in Russia. Doran. $2.
Chitwood, O. P. Immediate Causes of the Great War. Crowell. $1.50.
Ely, R. T. The World War and Leadership in a Democracy. Macmillan. $1.50.
Fred Mitchell's War Story. Knopf. $1.50.
Glenn, Garrard. The Army and the Law. Columbia University Press.
Hillis, N. D. The Blot on the Kaiser's Scutcheon. Revell. $1.
Jones, J. P., and Hollister, P. M. The German Secret Service in America 1914-1918. Small, Maynard. $2.
Krause, K. L. What Is the German Nation Dying For? Boni, Liveright. $1.50.
Merrill, Wainwright. A College Man in Khaki. Doran. $1.50.
Stidger, W. L. Soldier Silhouettes on Our Front. Scribners. $1.25.
The Love of an Unknown Soldier. Lane. $1.25.
Von Freytag-Loringhoven. A Nation Trained in Arms. Putnam. $1.25.

JUVENILE

Aldon, Adair. The Pirate of Jasper Peak. Macmillan. $1.35.
Altsheler, J. A. The Masters of the Peaks. Appleton. $1.35.
Altsheler, J. A. The Lost Hunters. Appleton. $1.35.
Ashmun, Margaret. Isabel Carleton's Friends. Macmillan. $1.35.
Barbour, R. H. For the Freedom of the Seas. Appleton. $1.35.
Bassett, S. W. The Story of Silk. Penn. 90 cents.
Beard, Dan. American Boys' Book of Signs, Signals, and Symbols. Lippincott. $2.
Brown, E. C. The Three Gays at the Old Farm. Penn. $1.
Curtis, A. T. The Little Maid of Old Connecticut. Penn. $1.
Fraser, C. C. The Boy Hikers. Crowell. $1.25.
Garland, John. Ross Grant in Miners' Camp. Penn. $1.35.
Gollomb, Joseph. That Year at Lincoln High. Macmillan. $1.35.
Hare, T. T. Philip Kent in the Upper School. Penn. $1.35.
Hudson, W. H. A Little Boy Lost. Knopf. $1.50.
Lear, Edward. The Book of Nonsense. Crowell. 50 cents.
Mackay, I. E. The Shining Ship. Doran. $1.50.
Pendleton, Louis. Captain Ted. Appleton. $1.35.
Stevenson, R. L. A Child's Garden of Verses. Crowell. 50 cents.
Usher, R. G. The Story of the Pilgrims for Children. Macmillan. $1.25.
Warde, Margaret. Nancy Lee's Namesake. Penn. $1.35.

EDUCATION

Faust, Cosette, and Thompson, Stith. Old English Poems. Scott, Foresman.
Fulton, M. G. National Ideals and Problems. Macmillan. $1.50.
Poor, C. L. Simplified Navigation for Ships and Aircraft. Century. $1.50.
Routzahn, G., and M. S. The A B C of Exhibit Planning. Russell Sage Foundation. $1.50.

MISCELLANEOUS

Check List of Collections of Personal Papers. Government Printing Office. 30 cents.
Joseph, Marie. Medical Vocabulary. Blakiston. 50 cents.
Pollard, Harold. Aero Engines, Magnetos, and Carburetors. Macmillan. $1.

NIGHTS IN LONDON

By THOMAS BURKE

Author of

Limehouse Nights, Etc.

A rich and piquant account of many adventures in as many parts of London, $1.50.

"An achievement worthy of Poe." —*Westminster Gazette.* "Merits a permanent place."—*Athenaeum.*

Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. 44th St. New York

The Latest Authoritative Book on Bulgaria, Turkey and The Balkans

THE CRADLE OF THE WAR

THE NEAR-EAST AND PAN-GERMANISM

By H. CHARLES WOODS, F.R.G.S.

A really valuable work, based on intimate, first-hand knowledge of the Near-East and its Rulers. Special chapters devoted to the Dardanelles campaign, the Salonica operations, the Bagdad Railway, and the designs of Germany under her Mittel-Europa scheme. *With valuable maps and illustrations.* $2.50 *net.*

LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Publishers BOSTON

The NATION is a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations which regularly audits and attests all figures given. A.B.C.

BINDER FOR THE NATION

To receive the current number in a convenient (temporary) form. Substantially made, bound in cloth, with THE NATION stamped on the side in gold. Holds about one volume. Papers easily and neatly adjusted. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of 75 cents. Address The Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two Sections Section II

International Relations Section

Vol. CVII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1918 No. 2783

British Imperial Preference

By the RT. HON. SIR GEORGE FOSTER

FOR the purposes of this article it will be sufficient to give a brief sketch of the evolution of the preferential trade idea within the British Empire and the successive steps by which the idea became clothed in enactment and developed into practice. The basic groundwork is fashioned by the sentiment generated by common origin, common institutions and forms of government, and by loyalty to the Empire from which spring and to which belong the dominant directing elements of the widespread dominions grouped beneath the Imperial flag.

Some forty years ago vague suggestions began to develop—academic and dispersed—lone voices lifted now from one part of the Empire and now from another. Gradually the scope of discussion extended and the voices multiplied, the idea enlarged from the newspaper and magazine to the platform and the halls of legislation, whence it became embodied in resolutions and translated into laws and treaty agreements. The Imperial Conferences, which began in 1887, participated in by representatives of the self-governing Dominions and the home Government, proved sympathetic nursing mothers of the growing sentiment.

The first trade preference was granted by Canada to the mother country, British India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements and the West Indies in 1898, and was not compensated by any return preference on the part of the recipients. To all goods imported thence into Canada, with the exception of refined sugar made from non-British raw product, and of tobacco and liquors, an entrance through the customs was granted at a reduction of one-quarter of the general tariff in 1898 and one-third from and after July, 1900.

In 1904, imports from New Zealand and South Africa were admitted to Canada on a similar basis, and these concessions were met by a compensating reduction of twelve and one-half per cent. upon certain Canadian products imported into New Zealand, and a preference of three per cent. ad valorem on Canadian importations into South Africa. New Zealand in 1904 gave a preference to Great Britain equal to that given to Canada. South Africa extended her preference to Great Britain in 1903 and to New Zealand in 1907. In 1906, agreements were made which resulted in preferential interchanges between South Africa and Australia in accordance with which certain commodities of each country were admitted into the other on a basis of three per cent. and five per cent. respectively of the general customs tariff prevailing in each, while in 1908 Australia extended her preference on a selected list to Great Britain. In 1911, Canada admitted to the benefits of her preferential tariff the products of all portions of the British Empire except Newfoundland, Australia, Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus and Hongkong, in the last four of which nearness to foreign countries made preference impracticable.

In 1912 a Conference participated in by delegates from Canada and from most of the West Indian colonies, met at Ottawa and came to an arrangement by which a mutual preference upon an accepted list of commodities in each geographical section was to be granted in the other. The agreement was to be in effect for ten years, and was confirmed by the necessary legislation. This arrangement went into effect on June 2, 1913, and continues until 1923. It includes all the British West Indian colonies except Bermuda, Jamaica, the Bahamas and British Honduras. The West Indian colonies give a preference of one-fifth of their general tariff on a selected list of Canadian products, and receive in return the full preference of about one-third of the Canadian general tariff on all their products. Provision was made for the inclusion in this arrangement of any of the last-mentioned colonies in case they intimated a wish to enter within three years of its conclusion; at which date, if they had not chosen to adhere to the agreement, their products would no longer be admitted into Canada on preferential terms. The West Indian colonies which entered the agreement also extended the preference given to Canada to products imported from Great Britain and Newfoundland.

It is to be noted that Canada, in 1898, included all the West Indian colonies in the preferential tariff, and had therefore given full preference from 1898 until 1912 without any return on the part of those colonies. It may also be noted that the same course has since been pursued in regard to Jamaica, Bermuda, the Bahamas, and Honduras, although up to the present time these colonies have given no preference to Canadian goods.

It will be noticed that no preferential relations have yet been established between Canada and Australia. This is not because in each of these Dominions there is not a sufficiently favorable sentiment. The opposite is, I believe, the fact. Negotiations have on several occasions been begun and carried to what promised a favorable conclusion. Chiefly owing, however, to the extremely short terms of office of the Governments of Australia, it has so happened in each case that an election and change of Government has taken place before the negotiations which had been begun could be completed or the necessary legislation obtained. The average life of the Governments of Australia since the formation of the Commonwealth in 1900 has been less than two years.

Since the war began no attempt at tariff legislation, other than what was dictated by war needs, has been made in any of the British Dominions. The mother country has not legislated in any way to meet the overseas Dominions with a compensating or sympathetic advantage of duties in its tariff. While the products of Great Britain now enter all the overseas Dominions at favored rates, the products of those Dominions enter the ports of Great Britain on exactly the same basis as those of all foreign countries.

Around this lack of response in kind has centred such controversial discussion as has arisen on the subject of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperial preference. So far preference has been one-sided; the younger and less wealthy or developed parts of the Empire have favored the products of the oldest, the most largely developed, and the wealthiest part without meeting any response in kind. There are many persons in the overseas Dominions who think that this is not only one-sided in respect of business, but unsympathetic in point of goodwill and unwise as a matter of Imperial policy. Yet it is true in Canada, and I think equally so in other overseas Dominions, that no considerable volume of public opinion has called for a suspension of the present preference. There has been a general and hearty acquiescence in its continuance, prompted by the deeper sentiments of loyalty and goodwill towards the mother country to whose early care and constant protection they owe so much. There is no doubt that in Great Britain, also, this sentiment is shared in an increasing degree, and is growing to such an extent that one is justified in believing that the end of the war will see the beginning of a policy which will issue in mutual preference on an Imperial scale.

The present status of Imperial preference may be summarized as follows: The mother country grants no preferential trade treatment to any part of the Empire. It receives preferential treatment from all the overseas Dominions except Newfoundland. Canada gives a preference of about one-third of her general customs duties to the whole British Empire excepting Australia, Newfoundland, Gibraltar, Cyprus, Hongkong and Malta, and receives compensating preferences as stated above from South Africa, New Zealand and the West Indies, except Jamaica, Bermuda, the Bahamas and British Honduras. New Zealand and Australia have mutual preference exchanges with South Africa but none between themselves. Newfoundland receives from the West Indies the same preference given by them to Canada, but gives none to either the mother country or the other overseas Dominions. The New Zealand preference is given in the form of a surtax on imports from non-preference countries.

It appears from the foregoing that Canada was the pioneer in preferential treatment in the Empire, that it includes in its preference the greater portion of the Empire countries, self-governing or other, and that its preference is the most substantial of any, amounting as it does to a reduction of about one-third of the general customs duties.

With the growth of the preferential idea important changes have followed in the treaty-making methods of Great Britain.

In the earlier times the home Government negotiated treaties with other Powers, including the colonies or not as best served the Imperial interests and without consulting their wishes in any respect. In this way it came about that the overseas Dominions later found themselves hampered and restricted in giving effect to their desires to establish preferential relations with the mother country. The Belgian and German treaties with Great Britain, for instance, compelled Canada or any other self-governing Dominion to grant to those countries whatever tariff concessions might be given by them to British imports, and thus effectually prevented any preferential treatment proposed to be given to Great Britain. In 1897, these treaties were denounced by the British Government, and since then the overseas Dominions have been free to grant preferences to British products without extending similar treatment to other most favored nations. No treaty conditions at any time debarred the self-governing parts of the Empire from concluding preferential arrangements among themselves, or prevented the mother country from giving favored treatment to her colonies and possessions without extending it to treaty nations.

Later, the British Government adopted the policy in making treaties of consulting the self-governing Dominions as to their inclusion therein, and for some years past the practice has been followed of inserting provisions in such treaties allowing the Dominions to adhere to the same within a certain time, and to withdraw from any to which they have adhered on giving one year's notice of their desire to do so. In 1871, on the occasion of the negotiation of the treaty with the United States, the practice was begun of associating a representative of Canada with representatives of Great Britain; and this has been followed since in cases where the interests of Canada were largely involved. Finally, Canada is now able to negotiate commercial treaties with foreign countries through agents of its own, acting with the knowledge and concurrence of the resident Ambassador or other representative of the British Government.

So much in respect of the past history and present status of preference within the Empire.

A period of thirty years has sufficed to change the vague dream of Imperial preference into a definite and practical fact, dominant and operative in all the overseas Dominions except Newfoundland, and with a strong tendency in the same direction in the great dependency of India. Successive Imperial conferences have by formal resolution affirmed the principle and the desirability of its extension by the mother country, so that it may become mutual throughout the Empire. In the meantime the overseas Dominions have not pressed the mother country to proceed in that direction contrary to its own conviction of duty and interest. In Great Britain, sentiment has grown continuously in its favor, and has at last culminated in the acceptance of the principle by the present Government and a declaration of its intention to embody it in practice upon the conclusion of the war. How far and in what manner the principle will be applied does not yet appear, but there is little doubt that a practical measure of mutual preference will be made operative throughout the Empire.

The discussions of thirty years have practically eliminated all but one of several proposed methods of solution. At first, many thought that the adoption of free trade by all portions of the Empire would ultimately settle the question, but the experience of the younger and outlying portions of the Empire, gained in working out their problems under conditions greatly different from those which prevail in the mother country, has finally negatived that possibility. The cumulative action of the overseas Dominions in relation to preference has indicated the only possible solution, and it remains now for Great Britain to adapt herself to this method or to decline to do so.

The arguments for solution along the lines of preference are compelling and, I believe, will prevail. The difficulties raised by ignorance, trade prejudice, self-interest, or lack of study and consideration of the subject have become less formidable in proportion as they have been contemplated in the light of examination and experience, while the advantages, not to say the necessities, of such a solution have be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come more and more apparent. Last of all has come the war, and with it the sacrifices, co-operation and close relationships made necessary by the contest, the goodwill and the wider knowledge which have resulted from joint effort, the vital interdependence in man-power and resources, and the proof of strength resulting from a merging of resources. All this has served to concentrate the sentiment for unity, not only in a constitutional and political sense, but in an economic and commercial sense as well. The loosely-knit but nevertheless strong ties of constitutional and race union can be supplemented by a community of economic and trade interest which will tend to the development and population of the Empire as a whole, and to the strengthening of the Empire itself and of the world.

The objection so long urged, that preference between the parts of the Empire would prejudicially affect trade between Great Britain and outside nations, has gradually lost force. Such force as it still retains is offset by the compensating gain in intra-Empire trade and development, to which the future sets scarcely any limit when the vastness, the richness, and the varied climatic conditions of the Empire are considered. It is a limited and weak vision which refuses to lift its gaze to the boundless horizons of growth and population and virile power possible to an Empire so widely distributed and so plentifully endowed. Nor in the coming days, when international goodwill and mutual interest shall tend to soften economic rivalries into economic helpfulness of each to all, need there be any apprehension that any Great Power will question the right of each nation so to regulate its internal commercial economy as, while strengthening itself, to make it thereby a greater factor for good in the economy of international uplift.

The Constitutional Reconstruction of India

By ROBERT L. SCHUYLER

EVEN in these days of startling change, when reorganization and reform are everywhere on the lips or in the thoughts of men, the reconstruction of India challenges attention, if for no other reason than because of the magnitude of the population and the interests that must be affected. Until last year benevolent despotism was the guiding principle of British policy in India. The British autocracy had indeed admitted native opinion to its counsels, but the reins of power it had kept in its own hands. Even the so-called Morley-Minto reforms of 1909, following a period of unrest, anti-British agitation, and revolutionary violence, involved no abandonment of the autocratic principle. They did indeed admit native elected members to a substantial number, though a minority, of seats in the central and provincial legislative councils. But restricted franchises, representation of special constituencies and indirect processes of election failed to create any sense of true responsibility on the part of elected members to the people at large, and Lord Morley, the Secretary of State for India, himself repudiated any idea that the reforms associated with his name looked toward the eventual establishment of a parliamentary régime in India. It is now generally admitted, both in India and in England, that the reforms of 1909 have in the long run failed to accomplish their purpose. By affording native Indians greater opportunity for the expression of political opposition, while at the same time withholding from them all control over and responsibility for administration, they have increased rather than allayed discontent and friction. They have led to the formation within the legislative councils of official *blocs*, whose members ordinarily vote as a unit with the Government, to the great irritation of the elected members who see themselves defeated by the silent official phalanx. The effect of the reforms has not been to encourage constructive statesmanship among the natives, but rather to foster irresponsible and destructive criticism.

In India, as elsewhere, the war has given a powerful impetus to the cause of reform. The politically-minded class of Western educated Indians, whose influence is out of all proportion to their numbers, demand that a struggle which has been proclaimed by British statesmen to be a crusade for democracy and the rights of nations be accompanied by the introduction of self-governing institutions in India. Their aspirations for self-determination have been stimulated by the events of the war, and notably by the Russian revolution. They dream of a future Indian nation, great, powerful, and prosperous. The war, furthermore, has made it impossible for enlightened public opinion in England to justify the continuance of the present system in India. The Englishman is never quite at ease in arguing the case for autocracy under any conditions, but when it came to fighting Prussianism in Europe and at the same time upholding despotism in India, his embarrassment became intolerable. He agrees with the progressive native that the government of India must be radically reformed.

In December, 1916, the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, the two great popular bodies which express the thought and aspirations of the politically-minded classes of India, adopted resolutions urging the British Government to announce "that it is the aim and intention of British policy to confer self-government on India at an early date," and demanding that certain specific reforms be immediately granted. This "Congress-League Scheme," as it is called, is the fullest and most authoritative statement of the claims and demands of the principal native political organizations. Indian reformers received their official answer on August 20, 1917, when Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, in reply to a question in the House of Commons, defined as the new aim of British Indian policy "the progressive realization of responsible government in India, as an integral part of the British Empire." His statement has correctly been called "the most momentous utterance ever made in India's chequered history." To Englishmen, "responsible government" has a precise meaning, and the use of it on this occasion, instead of the vaguer term "self-government," must have been deliberate. A high British official in India declared that it meant nothing less than "the administration of the country by an executive authority responsible through an elected legislature to the people."

It was decided that the Secretary of State should visit India for the purpose of preparing an official report in co-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

operation with the Government of India, outlining a programme of reform in accordance with the pronouncement of August 20. Mr. Montagu and his party reached India in November, and at once set about studying problems on the spot and striving to ascertain all shades of public opinion. They were literally deluged with schemes of reform. The "Congress-League Scheme" was carefully examined, but found to be inadmissible on several grounds, chiefly because, in proposing to make legislatures responsible to electorates while leaving executives responsible to the Secretary of State, it violated the basic principle of responsible government. Another plan of reform was set forth in a "Joint Address from Europeans and Indians," signed by a considerable number of British residents and natives. It was in large part based upon studies which had been made by Mr. Lionel Curtis, well-known as a thoughtful student of British Imperial problems, who was at the time conducting inquiries into Indian reform.

This plan of reform, which undoubtedly exerted much influence upon the Secretary of State, may be briefly analyzed. It accepts unconditionally the pronouncement of August 20, and defines responsible government as meaning "the creation of executives responsible to, and therefore removable at the will of, elective bodies and electorates." The goal to be sought, it holds, is a single self-governing Indian nation, forming a Dominion within the British Empire, and not a group of mutually independent Indian nations. In the process of gradually building up responsible government, the beginnings must be made in the sphere of local, rather than of central, government. Changes in the existing political map of India must be made. Burma, whose incorporation in India is wholly artificial, must be left out of calculation; what is far more important, the present provinces must be subdivided into areas for the operation of responsible government. The boldest proposal of the "Joint Address" is to create within the provinces new political divisions, to be known as "provincial States," and to establish in each an assembly chosen by a new electorate. To these bodies it is proposed to transfer certain functions of local government, such as public works, primary education, agriculture, and local finance. The administration of these functions is to be vested in Ministers drawn from the assembly and responsible to it, forming collectively a local Cabinet. The nominal head of each State, known as the Chief Commissioner, is to occupy a position similar to that of the Governor of a self-governing Dominion, and is always to act upon the advice of his Ministers with respect to the powers that have been transferred to the provincial State. The functions of the present provinces are viewed as progressively vanishing. During a transitional period provincial Governments will continue to exercise such powers as have not been transferred to the new States, and so long as they last they are to be responsible to the Secretary of State. At the expiration of a certain period, a commission is to review the working of the whole system throughout India, and report to the Secretary of State recommendations as to its further operation and extension. "The situation we desire to see," say the authors of this plan, "is one in which communities in all parts of British India can attain to new political powers, always, but only, by proving their fitness to exercise those they already possess."

The "Joint Address" was published in November, 1917, and at once provoked much criticism on various grounds. It may be that the scheme was too severely logical, and that, if adopted, it would have encountered strong opposition. But it had, at any rate, the merit of recognizing that self-government is a matter of practice as well as of knowledge, and that education alone will never produce the material for satisfactory electorates. Its authors perceived that it is only by the exercise of political rights and the assumption of political responsibilities that men can be trained in democracy.

The eagerly awaited Montagu report was completed in April of the present year, and has been published as an official Parliamentary Paper over the signatures of the Secretary of State and the Viceroy. It is a volume of 300 pages, divided into two almost equal parts. The first part recounts recent events in India, sketches the historical growth of the administrative system, outlines the development of the legislative councils, pictures the existing structure of Indian government, explains the conditions of the problems to be solved, and concludes with an analysis and criticism of the Congress-League Scheme. The second part sets forth in detail the proposals for reform.

The Report recommends that the earlier steps towards the realization of responsible government be taken in the provinces. It rejects the proposal of the Joint Address for the establishment of new provincial states for several reasons, but principally because it holds that any scheme for the geographical partition of the provinces would evoke an opposition that would be fatal to the cause of reform. According to the plan of the Report, there is to be in each province an enlarged legislative council, with a substantial majority of elected members chosen on a broad franchise. A large measure of legislative devolution is provided, securing the provinces from unnecessary interference by the Government of India. In each province the functions of government are to be divided into those which may be transferred to popular control, and those which must for the present be reserved in official hands. The list of transferred subjects would vary in the several provinces, but would include those functions of government in which Indians have shown themselves to be most interested and in the exercise of which mistakes would not be fatal. In each province the executive is to consist of two parts. This proposal may best be explained in the words of the Report.

> One part would comprise the head of the province and an executive council of two members. In all provinces the head of the Government would be known as Governor. . . . One of the two executive councillors would in practice be a European qualified by long official experience, and the other would be an Indian. . . . The Governor in Council would have charge of the reserved subjects. The other part of the Government would consist of one member, or more than one member, according to the number and importance of the transferred subjects, chosen by the Governor from the elected members of the legislative council. They would be known as ministers, . . . and they would be appointed for the lifetime of the legislative council, and if reëlected to that body would be reëligible for appointment as members of the executive. . . . The portfolios dealing with the transferred subjects would be committed to the ministers, and on these subjects the ministers, together with the Governor, would form the Administration. On such subjects their decisions would be final, subject only to the Governor's advice and control. We do not contemplate that from the outset the Governor should occupy the position of a purely constitutional Governor who is bound to accept the decisions of his ministers, . . . but we should expect him to refuse assent to the proposals of his ministers only when the consequences of acquiescence would clearly be serious.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The plan thus outlined does not in fact establish full responsible government on the English model, even with respect to the transferred functions, for the Governor is not to be under obligation to act upon the advice of his ministers. Only an optimistic doctrinaire could fail to see in the practical working of the scheme the possibility of endless friction and collisions—collisions between ministers and a Governor who need not act upon their advice, between ministers and a legislature which cannot remove them, and between the two parts of an Executive which strives to coördinate conflicting principles of government. Of the difficulties which may arise if their plan is put into operation, the authors of the Report are aware, and they recognize that the plan can be worked successfully only by mutual forbearance and a strong common purpose. But it seems to them to be the best plan that can be devised for the transitional period in which India is to pass from autocracy to self-government.

Pending actual experience of the working of the proposed provincial reforms, the central government of India is to remain responsible solely to the Secretary of State and the Imperial Parliament, but it, too, is to be reformed. The legislative department is to be represented by two houses, to be known as the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State. The Legislative Assembly is to consist of about one hundred members, of whom two-thirds are to be elected and one-third nominated by the Governor-General. The Council of State is to be composed of fifty members, of whom a majority are to be nominated and a minority elected. In the case of ordinary legislation the assent of both houses is to be necessary, but measures which the Governor-General certifies as essential to the interests of peace, order or good government, including fiscal bills, may be enacted into law upon their passage by the Council of State, even though the Assembly shall not have concurred. If the provincial reforms justify themselves, popular control is eventually to be extended to the central government.

It is obvious that the introduction and extension of the proposed reforms must, if the goal is responsible government, be accompanied by a relaxation of the external control now exercised by the Secretary of State. The Report, therefore, recommends the immediate appointment of a committee to consider the reorganization of the India Office. At the same time it urges that measures be adopted to increase the interest of Parliament in and its knowledge of Indian affairs, both of which have in the past been very slight.

No greater problem of constructive statesmanship ever confronted any Government than that raised by the necessity for constitutional reform in India. Unfortunately, the problem cannot receive among those responsible for its solution the attention which it deserves. Even in normal times the English public has not shown itself sensitive to questions of India policy, and Parliamentary control is nominal rather than real. At the moment, moreover, the Government, Parliament, and people of the United Kingdom are preoccupied with the supreme task of winning the war, and to this enterprise even a question that affects the interests and well-being of a fifth of the human race may well seem incidental. It is scarcely to be supposed that public opinion will force from power on account of its Indian policy a Government that shows its ability to conduct the war successfully. The white man's burden in this case rests upon the shoulders of the Government and the India Office.

Documents

Resolutions of the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist Conference.

AN article on the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist Conference at London, September 17-20, was published in the International Relations section of the *Nation* of October 19. The following are the more important resolutions adopted by the Conference.

The Austro-Hungarian Peace Note

This Conference has given fullest consideration to the Note which the Austro-Hungarian Government has addressed to each of the belligerents.

By proposing to the latter a secret conference for the discussion of the possibilities of peace, the Austro-Hungarian Government evidently wishes to give the appearance of satisfaction to the desire of the peoples for peace, and to throw on the Governments of the Entente the responsibility for the continuation of the war.

The fact that it is not yet known whether the initiative in this peace offensive comes from Austria only or conjointly from the two Central Powers appears to indicate that the Austrian proposal has been dictated more by anxiety to strengthen the internal cohesion of the Monarchy than by the desire to coöperate effectively in the settlement of the world conflict.

This Conference is of opinion that the Allied Governments would be assuming a heavy and perilous responsibility by adopting a purely negative policy.

The Allied Governments, in reply, should make clear the identity of their views by close and continuous coöperation and a public and collective declaration of their aims and intentions. They should subscribe to the fourteen points formulated by President Wilson, thus adopting a policy of clearness and moderation as opposed to a policy dictated exclusively by changes in the war map; and, finally, they should interrogate their opponents in regard to their general and particular war aims, which have never been defined, thus imposing upon the working classes the responsibility of choosing between the solutions proposed.

The Government of the United States has already been able to reject the proposal of the Austro-Hungarian Government by observing that, having clearly and publicly formulated its own war aims, it did not see the use of reproducing the same declarations in a secret conference.

It is by defining their own war aims, jointly with the United States, with the same precision and clearness, that the Allied Governments will give to the workers of the world the conviction that they are resolved to continue the struggle not in order to meet the aggression of the Central Monarchies by undertaking in their turn a war of conquest, but for the single purpose of establishing on an unassailable foundation a peace which will be just and lasting, and in conformity with the aspirations of international democracy.

Russia

(1) This Conference sends an expression of deepest sympathy to the labor and Socialist organizations of Russia, which, after having destroyed their own imperialism, continue an unremitting struggle against German imperialism.

(2) It declares that if the treaty of Brest-Litovsk stands, it would confirm the collapse of the Russian revolution, and would most gravely compromise the future of the democracy of the world. It invites the workers of the allied countries to refuse to recognize any peace settlement which does not secure the complete freedom of the Russian people.

(3) The Conference is of opinion that, in conformity with Article 6 of the fourteen points of President Wilson, the present efforts of the Allied Governments to assist the Russian people must be influenced only by a genuine desire to preserve liberty and democracy in an ordered and durable world-peace, in which the beneficent fruit of the revolution shall be made permanently secure.

War Aims

The Conference welcomes the participation of the American Federation of Labor, and recognizes, in agreement with the Federation, in this world-war a conflict between autocratic and democratic institutions, a contest between the opportunities of self-development from free institutions and that of arbitrary control of government by groups or individuals for selfish ends.

The Conference agrees that after four years of war it is essential that the peoples and the Governments of all countries should have a full and definite knowledge of the spirit and determination of this Inter-Allied Conference representative of the workers of the respective countries with reference to the prosecution of the war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In accordance with the declaration of the previous conferences of February, 1915, and February, 1918, the Conference declares it to be its unqualified determination to do all that lies in its power to assist the Allied countries in the marshalling of all their resources, to the end that the armed forces of the Central Powers may be driven off the soils of the nations which they have invaded and now occupy, and, furthermore, that these armed forces shall be opposed so long as they carry out the orders or respond to the control of the militaristic and autocratic Governments of the Central Powers, which now threaten the existence of all self-governing peoples.

The Conference further welcomes the confirmation in all essential features which the fourteen propositions laid down by President Wilson, and presented to the Conference by the American Federation of Labor, give to the proposals contained in the Memorandum on War Aims agreed to by the Conference of 24th February, 1918. The Conference accepts these fourteen propositions as a concise summary of the main principles which the Memorandum on War Aims expounds in detail on the various questions to be dealt with, and agrees that only in these principles can the groundwork for a lasting peace be found.

The Conference accordingly calls upon the several Governments of the Allied nations unequivocally to adopt these principles as formulated by President Wilson and expounded in the Memorandum on War Aims, in a joint declaration of Allied policy, and the Conference recommends the representative organizations of the workers in each country to bring pressure to bear upon the Government in order to induce it to adopt this course.

The Conference once more takes note of the tremendous sacrifices which the world is requiring from the mass of the people in each country. It declares that because of their response in defence of principles of freedom the peoples have earned the right to wipe out all vestiges of the old idea that the Government belongs to or constitutes a "governing class." In determining issues that will vitally affect the lives and welfare of millions of wage-earners, justice requires that they should have direct representation on the agencies authorized to make such decisions. The Conference therefore declares that—

1. In the official delegations from each of the belligerent countries which will formulate the peace treaty the workers should have direct official representation.

2. A world labor congress shall be held at the same time and place as the peace conference that will formulate the peace treaty closing the war.

The Conference further welcomes the declaration by the American Federation of Labor of the fundamental principles to be included in the peace treaty, as being in substantial agreement with those applied in detail in the Memorandum on War Aims of 20th-24th February appended hereto, and also with the fourteen propositions of President Wilson.

The Conference further expresses its general sympathy with the aspirations of the American Federation of Labor. The Conference places special importance on the proposals which provide for an advanced conception of the right of the worker to complete self-control, and for the unabridged freedom of association and expression.

The Conference declares its objection to all treaties and agreements purporting to bind nations, which have been or may be concluded by their Governments without immediate publicity and without Parliamentary authority or ratification; and protests against the continuation for a single day of the present war for the purpose of obtaining any objects aimed at by any of the secret treaties or agreements which are not in accord with the fourteen propositions of President Wilson or the Memorandum on War Aims.

The Conference, taking note of the declarations and replies made to the Memorandum on War Aims of 20th-24th February by the labor and Socialist movements of the several countries in alliance with the Central Powers,

1. Expresses its satisfaction with the replies of the Bulgarian and Hungarian Socialists, and the German Social Democratic party of Austria, in so far as they accept the decisions of the London Conference as the basis of discussion at an international meeting; and

2. Expresses its deep regret that the reply of the German Majority—though their published letter expresses their willingness to attend an international—does not accept the London proposals, and fails officially to accept even the neutrals' proposals as a basis of discussion. So long as these points remain unanswered they create an obstacle to the holding of an international conference.

The Conference directs that the commission to be appointed for this purpose shall, as soon as may be possible, draft and forward replies through the press and other channels to the labor and Socialist parties whose replies indicate a willingness to discuss the situation on the agreed basis, pointing out that the difficulty in the way of an immediate international meeting is that the German response does not fulfil the conditions laid down by the Conference of 20th-24th February, and urging them to use their influence to get the German attitude changed, and also to send a considered reply to the German Majority. . . .

Passports

The Conference, in view of the refusal of the Governments to afford passport facilities to the properly elected representatives of organized labor, condemns the policy of the Governments, and declares that the continuance of such policy is bound to lead to an acceptance of the Government's challenge by the organized labor movement.

The Conference warns the Governments that the patience of the organized working people is rapidly becoming exhausted by the continued affronts which are thus offered.

A Canadian Order in Council.

THE following Order in Council, all the substantive sections of which are here given, is taken from the *Canadian Official Record* of October 1. The Order in Council was presented to the Governor General on September 24, for sanction under the War Measures Act of 1914. Paragraph (b) of Section 1 provides that wherever in the Order an offence is made punishable by fine and imprisonment, it shall be competent for the court to impose, in its discretion, either fine and imprisonment or fine or imprisonment. Press dispatches report the appointment of a Dominion Director of Public Safety; the proposed creation of committees of public safety in districts having "a considerable alien enemy element" or "where it is necessary to overcome Bolshevist organization and propaganda"; the suppression of a Socialist paper at Toronto and of Russian and Ukrainian papers at Winnipeg; and repressive measures at Toronto and Montreal.

2. The following associations, organizations, societies, or groups are hereby declared to be and shall while Canada is engaged in war be deemed to be unlawful associations, viz.:

(a) The Industrial Workers of the World;
The Russian Social Democratic Party;
The Russian Revolutionary Group;
The Russian Social Revolutionists;
The Russian Workers Union;
The Ukrainian Revolutionary Group;
The Ukrainian Social Democratic Party;
The Social Democratic Party;
The Social Labor Party;
Group of Social Democrats of Bolsheviki;
Group of Social Democrats of Anarchists;
The Workers International Industrial Union;
Chinese Nationalist League;
Chinese Labor Association;

(b) Any association, organization, society, or corporation, one of whose purposes or professed purposes is to bring about any governmental, political, social, industrial, or economic change within Canada by the use of force, or physical injury to person or property, or by threats of such injury, or which teaches, advocates, advises, or defends the use of force, or physical injury to person or property, or of such injury to person to accomplish such change, or for any other purpose, or which shall by any means prosecute or pursue such purpose or professed purpose, or shall so teach, advocate, advise, or defend while Canada is engaged in war;

(c) Any association which the Governor in Council by notice published in the *Canada Gazette* declares to be an unlawful association or within the description of the last preceding paragraph.

3. Any person who, while Canada is engaged in war, shall act, or profess to act as an officer of any such unlawful association, or who shall sell, speak, write, or publish anything as the representative or professed representative of any such unlawful association, or become or continue to be a member thereof, or wear, carry, or cause to be displayed upon or about his person or elsewhere, any badge, insignia, emblem, banner, motto, pennant, card, or other device whatsoever, indicating or intended to show or suggest that he is a member of or in anywise associated with any such unlawful association, or who shall contribute anything as dues or otherwise to it or to any one for it, or who shall solicit subscriptions or contributions therefor, shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations, punishable by imprisonment for not less than one year and not more than five years.

4. In any prosecution under this Act, if it be proved that the person charged has at any time since the beginning of the present war been a member of an unlawful association, it shall be presumed in the absence of proof to the contrary that he continued to be a member thereof at all times material to the case; and if it be proved that the person charged since the beginning of the war repeatedly

(a) attended meetings of an unlawful association; or
(b) spoke publicly in advocacy of an unlawful association; or
(c) distributed literature of an unlawful association, it shall be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presumed in the absence of proof to the contrary that he is a member of such unlawful association.

5. Where in any prosecution any question of unlawful intent or purpose is in issue the fact that the accused is a member of an unlawful association which practices, advocates, or incites with that intent or purpose shall be relevant to the issue.

6. Any owner, lessee, agent, or superintendent of any building, room, premises, or place, who while Canada is engaged in war knowingly permits therein any meeting of an unlawful association, or of any subsidiary association or branch or committee thereof, or any assemblage of persons who teach, advocate, advise or defend the use without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations, punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for not more than five years.

7. (1) Any property, real or personal, belonging or suspected to belong to an unlawful association or held, or suspected to be held, by any person for or on behalf thereof may, without warrant, be seized or taken possession of by any person thereunto authorized by the Minister [of Justice] or by the Chief Commissioner of Dominion Police, and may thereupon be forfeited to His Majesty.

(2) Any books, newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets, pictures, papers, circulars, cards, letters, writings, prints, handbills, posters, publications or documents of any kind issued by or on behalf of an unlawful association or advocating its propaganda, may without warrant be seized or taken possession of by any peace officer, police officer or constable, or by any person thereunto authorized by the Minister [of Justice], and may thereupon be forfeited to His Majesty.

(3) Any person thereunto authorized may without warrant at any hour of the day or night, with such assistance as he may require, break into and enter any premises or place owned or suspected to be owned or occupied by an unlawful association, or in which any member of an unlawful association is or is believed to be, and seize any articles, books, documents, or papers found therein which belong or are suspected to belong to, or to be used or intended to be used for the purpose of any unlawful association or for any prohibited or unlawful purpose, and the same may thereupon be forfeited to His Majesty.

* * * * * * * * *

8. Any person who, while Canada is engaged in war, knowingly prints, publishes, edits, issues, circulates, sells, offers for sale, or distributes any book, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, picture, paper, circular, card, letter, writing, print, publication, or document of any kind in which is taught, advocated, advised, or defended, or who shall in any manner teach, advocate, advise, or defend the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, as a means of accomplishing any governmental, political, social, industrial, or economic change or otherwise, shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations punishable by imprisonment for not more than five years and not less than one year.

9. No meeting or assemblage of any kind except church meetings or meetings for religious services only, shall be held in Canada during the present war at which the proceedings or any part thereof are conducted in the language or any of the languages of any country or portion of any country with which Canada is at war, or in the language or any of the languages of Russia, Ukraine or Finland, and any wilfully attending or taking part in any meeting prohibited as aforesaid by this section shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for not more than five years, and if found committing such offence may be apprehended without warrant by any peace officer, police officer or constable and taken before any magistrate having jurisdiction to be dealt with according to law.

10. Any person who during the present war wilfully attends or takes part in any meeting or assemblage of persons

(a) at which the doctrines or propaganda of an unlawful association are advocated or defended; or

(b) at which false reports or statements are made which may interfere, or tend to interfere, with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of Canada, the Empire or its Allies, or which may cause or incite or tend to cause or incite sedition, disloyalty, insubordination, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of Canada, obstruct or interfere with the recruiting or enlistment service of Canada, or whereby injury or mischief is likely to be occasioned to any public interest;

(c) at which any seditious, disloyal, profane, scurrilous, or abusive language is uttered as to the established form of Government of Canada or as to the military or naval forces or flags of Canada or of the Empire or its Allies or the uniform of the military or naval forces of Canada or of the Empire or its Allies; or

(d) at which any language is uttered tending to bring the established form of Government of Canada or her military or naval forces or the flags of Canada or of the Empire or its Allies, into contempt, scorn, contumely, or disrepute; or

(e) at which any language is uttered which may tend to incite, provoke or encourage resistance to Canada or the Empire or its Allies, or to promote the cause of its or their enemies, or which may tend to urge, incite or encourage any curtailment of production in Canada of any things or products necessary or essential to the prosecution of the war; or

(f) at which any language is uttered which may tend to cause disaffection to His Majesty or to prejudice the relations of His Majesty with any foreign State, or to assist or encourage His Majesty's enemies or otherwise prevent, embarrass or hinder the successful prosecution of any war in which Canada is engaged, or who by any act supports or favors the cause of any country with which Canada is at war, or opposes the cause for which Canada is at war, shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations punishable by imprisonment for not more than five years and not less than one year.

The German Socialists' Conditions

A number of fragmentary versions of the conditions under which the German Socialists agreed to take office in the Ministry of Prince Maximilian of Baden have appeared in the American press. The following "official announcement" of the terms is taken from *Vorwärts* of September 24.

The Reichstag Social Democrats and the party executive of the German Social Democrats in common meeting, but by separate voting, resolved to allow members of their party to participate in a new Government eventually to be formed on the following conditions:

First, acceptance without any reserve of the Reichstag resolution of July 19, 1917, and a declaration of readiness to join a league of nations founded on a basis of the peaceful adjustment of all differences; universal disarmament.

Second, a declaration regarding Belgium in such a manner that no suspicion shall remain behind; the restoration of Belgium; an arrangement and indemnification; and also the restoration of Serbia and Montenegro.

Third, neither the Brest-Litovsk nor the Bucharest peace must be a hindrance to universal peace. The immediate introduction of civil administration in occupied regions. On the conclusion of peace the occupied regions must be immediately surrendered; democratic representation must be established as speedily as possible.

Fourth, autonomy for Alsace-Lorraine; universal, secret, and direct franchise for all German Federal States; the immediate dissolution of the Prussian Diet if equal franchise does not follow immediately from the discussions of the Committee of the Upper House.

Fifth, unity in Imperial Government; exclusion of irresponsible subsidiary governments; appointment of Government representatives from the Parliamentary majority or of such persons as agree with the political majority; abolition of Article 9 of the Constitution; publications of the Crown and the military authorities to be communicated to the Chancellor before publication.

Sixth, the immediate abolition of all prescriptions restricting the freedom of assembly and of the press; the censorship may only be applied to purely military questions (questions relating to war, strategy, tactics, troop movements, and preparation of war material); the establishment of a political central bureau for all measures adopted on the basis of a state of siege; the abolition of all military institutions exerting political influence.

The Reichstag resolution referred to above is as follows:

As on August 4, 1914, so on the threshold of the fourth year of the war, the German people stand upon the assurance of the speech from the throne: "We are driven by no lust of conquest."

Germany took up arms in defence of its liberty and independence and for the integrity of its territories. The Reichstag labors for peace and a mutual understanding and lasting reconciliation among the nations. Forced acquisitions of territory and political, economic and financial usurpations are incompatible with such a peace.

The Reichstag rejects all plans aiming at an economic blockade and the stirring up of enmity among the peoples after the war. The freedom of the seas must be assured. Only an economic peace can prepare the ground for the friendly association of the peoples.

The Reichstag will energetically promote the creation of international judicial organizations. So long, however, as the enemy Governments do not accept such a peace, so long as they threaten Germany and her allies with conquest and violation, the German people will stand together as one man, hold out unshaken, and fight until the rights of Germany and its allies to life and development are secured. The German nation united is unconquerable.

The Reichstag knows that in this announcement it is at one with the men who are defending the Fatherland; in the heroic struggles they are sure of the undying thanks of the whole people.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Press

Have the Allies a Russian Policy?

THE *Manchester Guardian* (September 11), in an editorial entitled "The Bolsheviks and Their Opponents," says:

According to one report, the American diplomats who have just left Russia still believe the Bolshevik Government to be the only political force with a real hold upon Russia, and still doubt the imminence of its downfall. Nevertheless, the possibility of the Bolsheviks' falling must be taken account of. British and French policy, at any rate, manifestly seek it. Do the Allies know what is going to take the place of the Bolsheviks, or what they intend should take the place of the Bolsheviks? It is no use for the Allies while they are working for the overthrow of the Bolsheviks, the *de facto* Government of Great Russia and undoubtedly the strongest single political force in that country, to profess that they have no notion of intervening in internal Russian affairs. They are assuming by deed the responsibility for the fall of the Bolsheviks, should that come about, and the chaos that must follow upon that event. Again, it is not profitable for the Allies to say that they will recognize any Government that succeeds in establishing itself in Russia, and it is still less profitable to add the qualification—any Government that will declare war on Germany. Nearly every Russian loathes the Germans, but still more Russians loathe war. We have seen enough already in Siberia and at Archangel of the irreconcilable nature of Russian party feuds to know that no Russian Government is likely to be evolved by purely Russian effort out of the chaos that will succeed the overthrow of the Bolsheviks, except after prolonged anarchy; and even so, any such Government may be at the mercy of the assassin. The Russian parties that are hoping and planning to step into the shoes of the Bolsheviks will certainly canvass for the support of the Allies. What will the Allies say to them? An answer they must have ready. They cannot evade the responsibility of giving one. Have they yet thought the matter out? To take one elemental question which they must decide if it is put to them, as put to them it will almost certainly be. One broad fundamental division parts the Russian enemies of the Bolsheviks, monarchist and republican. Do the Allies favor a monarchy for Russia, in other words the restoration of the Romanoffs, or do they favor a republic? It is no use the Allies saying that this is a question for the Russians themselves to decide, if the Allies have intervened, have helped to bring the Bolsheviks down, and are the one solid military fact in Great Russia. It may be, although it is far too early to be dogmatic, that the military problems of Allied intervention in Russia will turn out to be less formidable than was expected, but the political problems will still remain, arduous, gigantic, momentous for the history of the world. Have the Allies a political policy for Russia? If so, what is it?

The Plight of Germany

THE Socialist paper *Vorwärts* draws the following picture of conditions in Germany at the end of September.

We must to-day, with all necessary courage, consider the following situation as possible: Bulgaria deserts the Quadruplice to make peace with the Entente. Austria-Hungary and Turkey associate themselves with this step. That means that in the southwest our arm no longer reaches past Bodenbach, and that we lose all influence over the part of Poland and the Ukraine occupied by Austria. Then we German people stand alone against the French, British, Italians, Americans, and their numerous auxiliary peoples, and are fighting with our back to the wall and ruin before our eyes.

But we must still further extend the picture. Discouragement takes possession of our soldiers; the West front breaks; the enemy streams into our country; German towns go up in smoke and flames; troops and fugitives roll eastward; their procession mingles with the retreating army, penetrates all our towns, overcrowds houses, camps in the open air, confronts the authorities with insurmountable tasks, and spreads everywhere the spirit of hopeless depression. The food supply now entirely fails; there is no more coal, and in consequence no light, no trams; industry comes to a standstill; hundreds of thousands die; a spirit of madness takes possession of the survivors; revolts break out and an attempt is made to crush them with bloody force; instead of war outside our frontiers, there is war at home, trenches in the streets, machine guns in the houses, corpses of men, women and children on the pavement; death reigns.

Meanwhile the Government—the third, fifth, seventh which has been set up since the fall of the last, treats with our opponents. As it has no longer any strength of resistance behind it, it gives the enemy everything he wants. The Imperial Bank issues milliard on milliard of bills, undertakes any obligation pressed upon it, for it must have peace at any price. But this will be no peace of promise. It will be hell upon earth, worse even than war.

It is because this picture has never left us that we Social Democrats always championed national defence. To be sure, even this gloomy picture would have its bright spots. In the general confusion much would go to the devil which we Social Democrats have long wished there. The clearance would be thorough, but who wants to pay such a price, especially as what he wants can be had more cheaply? The West front must, therefore, remain firm; not to protect those in power. Every one of our people out there must realize that more depends on him than ever. It is now in reality not a question of conquests, but of obtaining peace without disorder and without unbearable burdens. The steadfastness of a few weeks may spare us many years of misery.

The Government must do everything possible to come to a conference table together with its Allies as speedily as possible. It must be a Government of the German democracy which goes to the conference. Guarantees are necessary that it is not only summoned in order to relieve those formerly responsible of the unpleasantness of the conclusion of peace, but that it is there, too, according to the people's will, to watch over the permanent preservation of peace. The greatest war which humanity has experienced ends, as all far-seeing people from the very first said, as a pure German war of defence. As such it must now as quickly as possible, and as well as possible, be brought to an end.

Ministerialism at Paris and Berlin.

THE following attack upon Scheidemann and other German Socialists appears in *Le Populaire* (Paris) of October 5. *Le Populaire* is the organ of Jean Longuet, the leader of the French Minority Socialists.

It is announced that some of the German Socialists have entered the ministerial combination of which the Prince of Baden is the head.

I observe that certain Majority comrades take advantage of the occasion to denounce once more the imperialistic Socialists of Germany.

It is not we who defend Schiedemann and his friends. Our sympathies go out to their courageous opponents, from Kautsky to Liebknecht; and we hope that the latter will be the ones who, once for all, will lead the German people to the attack, not only upon the Hohenzollern dynasty, but upon the whole capitalistic system which it is necessary to destroy there as here.

We would like to remark, however, that the German Majority are not so different from the French Majority, and that it ill becomes the latter to throw stones.

If the fact that France was in danger justified the presence of comrades on the Government benches, how may one deny that Schiedemann and his colleagues are right in upholding a Germany which in its turn is seriously threatened?

I know that the Majority of the Social Democrats ought to be reproached for their silence, their ridiculously inadequate opposition to the violation of Belgium, the repeated exhibitions of imperialism, the treaties of Brest-Litovsk.

We reproach them for this, as do the Minority who there fight against them.

Yet, once more, those who were ministers, or forgers of ministers, at the time when the dealings of Doumergue, of St. Jean de Maurienne, the letters of Charles I, were entering into history, have no lesson in working-class politics to give to any one.

Their unheard-of approbation of Allied military intervention against the Soviet Republic will not have the effect of regaining for them the Socialist character which they have lost.

The French Press and the Censorship

THE following manifesto, taken from *La France Libre* (Paris) of September 1, is published over the names of *La Bataille, La France Libre, L'Heure, L'Humanité, Le Journal du Peuple, La Lanterne, L'Oeuvre, Le Pays, Le Populaire, Le Rappel,* and *La Vérité.* The omission of *L'Homme Libre,* Premier Clemenceau's paper, from the list is significant.

One of the essential bases of the Republic is the right of every citizen to write, speak, print, and publish freely.

In France, one of the constant tasks of democrats and republicans, in the course of the political convulsions of the last century, was to achieve the exercise of this right, affirmed by the Constitution of 1791, stipulated in the Charter of 1830, and recognized in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practice during long years by the Governments of the Third Republic.

The most famous writers have not ceased to recognize the liberty of the press as the fundamental guarantee of popular sovereignty. Paul Louis Courrier, among others, did not hesitate to announce: "Publish what you think! That is not a right, it is a duty."

Anatole France, admittedly in our time master of French letters, has denounced the sad effect of the political censorship during the war as a régime under which "France wears a bandage over its eyes and a gag in its mouth."

This censorship, destroyer of the liberties of the citizen, violates at the same time the principles and laws of the Republic.

It lowers France in the estimation of neutral Powers.

It favors the intrigues and schemes of the enemy by furnishing unwittingly an argument in support of the Pan-Germans, who question whether the Allies are fighting for the liberty and rights of peoples and citizens.

Further, the censorship has been demanded, defended, and acclaimed by the enemies of the Republic. Royalist conspirators have announced on several occasions that the reëstablishment of the censorship in France was the first victory of the monarchist spirit.

In fact, the censorship serves powerfully the cause of factions and of dictators.

It has discredited the press before public opinion.

Republican traditions, accordingly, make clear to the democratic press the duty to be performed, the right to be asserted, in the interest of the country and of the Republic.

Reaction, exploiting both the *union sacrée* and the censorship, has for four years sought by all means in its power to divide and demoralize this republican country by imposing upon opinion and upon the public authorities the dictatorship of calumny.

The liberty of the press ought not to be confused with the immunity of calumny.

If every man has the imprescriptible right to express his opinion, he ought also to have the right of obtaining redress against the calumny of which he may be the victim.

In the present state of the law, calumny is practically immune, and the redress due to the person who suffers from it, as a matter of fact, inoperative.

There should, accordingly, be incorporated in the law, without delay, some new provisions designed to safeguard the rights of citizens in the interest of the liberty of the press.

For this reason, taking at their full value the words recently spoken by Anatole France at La Chavonnière, on the occasion of the commemoration ceremony in honor of Paul Louis Courrier—"since we all are persuaded that our soldiers are fighting for justice and liberty, let us labor to preserve for them, for these soldier citizens, a free country, the friend of justice"—the journals named below declare their opinion that the time has come for the formation of a group for action and solidarity under the name of "Association of the Democratic Press of Paris, the Departments, and the Colonies."

The Polish National Council.

THE *Echo Polonais* (Paris) of October 1 publishes the following significant statement, issued by the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs, regarding the status of the Polish National Council at Paris. The head of the Council, Roman Dmowski, attended the recent Polish conference at Detroit.

The Polish National Council has never been recognized by the Allies as a Polish Government. However, being in reality the representative of certain Polish elements which are opposed to any compromise with the Central Governments, it represents the sole responsible element that could answer the purpose of a go-between from the Allies to the Poles abroad; and the relations of the Allies with it regarding Polish current affairs have so far been satisfactory from every point of view. In any case, it has always been the effort of the British Government to leave no doubt that the British Government does not associate itself with the personal opinions of any of the members of the Council, but that, on the contrary, it desires that the Council shall be able to develop its sphere of influence to such an extent that it could be recognized as the representative of all the Polish political parties. The known members of the Committee have always, during the war, coöperated with the Allies and could be depended upon; naturally, therefore, the Governments of the Allies are inclined to work with them further as with representatives of a Government organization at a time when there is need of discussion with a responsible political agency qualified to speak regarding the Polish question. Until the present time there has been no other Polish organization which was able and ready to undertake such work and which could ask recognition of its fitness.

The British Railway Strike.

THE *New Statesman* (London) of September 28 comments as follows upon the responsibility of the Government for the recent railway strike in South Wales.

What is required is a wider outlook. We must never forget the sound aphorism of political science that popular revolts, however seemingly causeless, arise only from real hardships, which frequently fail to find expression in the demands of those who revolt. It is not a question of whether or not the revolters are justified, which is an issue for the moralist. What the statesman is concerned with is explanation and causation, and the most efficient social reaction. It is his business to discover where the shoe pinches, and to take the necessary steps to afford relief. It is perhaps not without significance that the engine-drivers struck, not all over the country, but primarily and principally in South Wales. When, nine months ago, Mr. Lloyd George sought to discover the causes of "labor unrest," it was in South Wales that the Commissioners found the most serious and the most widespread unrest, and it was there that they recited the longest and most impressive list of the hardships and grievances endured by the wage-earning class. The Commissioners did not find that these grievances and hardships were felt more by one section than by another. They did not foresee any special revolt by the locomotive engine-drivers. But the really intolerable conditions of working-class life in many of the shapeless urban aggregations of the South Wales valleys—the appalling housing accommodation, the all-pervading dirt, the primitive insanitation, the absence of the common amenities of civilization, the scandalous infantile mortality, child death-rate and excess of sickness among adults, the barbarous cost and inefficiency of the retail supply of milk and meat and other foods, the manifold extortions to which the poorer inhabitants are exposed, all aggravated by the temporary local scarcity of jam and cheese and margarine and beer, and by local examples of what seems shameless capitalist profiteering—afford cause enough, as the Government's own Commissioners did not shrink from hinting, for very serious revolt. It may be that the exigencies of wartime have rendered impracticable, during these nine months, any redress of the old standing grievances of South Wales which the Report of the Commission on Labor Unrest have so vividly exposed. But the failure of the Government even to set going any improvements—what, for instance, is Mr. Hayes Fisher's total housing programme for South Wales, how many sites has he actually secured, for how many tens of thousands of additional cottages are the plans and specifications already prepared?—afford explanation enough, though we do not say justification, for revolts such as that of the South Wales railwaymen. Indeed, it is, on the whole, of healthy promise for the community that the great body of wage-earners are refusing to sit quiet under the scandalous conditions of life to which they have so long been exposed. It is only a pity that they do not express, in their demands, what it is that is really at the bottom of their revolt. What is plain is that there can be no going back, when the war ends, to either the economic or the social or the political conditions of 1914. Reconstruction must mean, not reversion—as apparently some Ministers are, at lunches to which the press is not admitted, assuring some capitalists—but, as the Labor party phrases it to very receptive audiences all over the country, a "new social order." Unless the Government manages to conduct this essential business of peace with at least as much insight and sincerity, and at least as much continuity of vigor as they have put into the conduct of the war, we shall have, during the next few years—perhaps with equally little justification on the immediate issues involved—more and more serious revolts than that of the railway engine-drivers.

Protection in Great Britain.

THE London *Morning Post*, in its issue of October 4, makes the following thinly-disguised plea for protection. The address of Sir Albert Stanley which is referred to was delivered at London on October 3, before the Industrial Reconstruction Council.

A good many clever people are impatient of all talk of commerce and industry at the present time. They suggest that such matters are too sordid to engage the statesmen of a nation in times like these, and they regard all the efforts of our producers and manufacturers to obtain protection for British industry as inspired by nothing more magnanimous than greed of gain. That is not how we look at these affairs. It has been driven in upon us by the events of this war that the true foundations of national security are the industries and the production of the country. We believe that the dangerous growth of German power was mainly due to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the neglect of our industries and our agriculture; we believe that Germany would not have dared to go to war if she had not calculated that our weakness in such essentials of life as food and steel would prevent us from taking up the challenge. We believe that Germany stood out against the Allies so long largely because she produced as much steel as all the Allies put together, and because her power of manufacturing all munitions of war was superior to the united power of the Allies when war began. And we believe further that if our industries and our agriculture are allowed to decay after the war no alliances or leagues will save the British Empire from destruction.

In this matter our Government has had no policy, despite the fact that our chambers of commerce and associations of manufacturers have repeatedly represented the urgency of the case. We hazard a guess that the latest attempt to get something definite out of the Government has failed like its predecessors, and we are not altogether reassured by the excellent sentiments expressed in the speech of Sir Albert Stanley. The sentiments of the President of the Board of Trade are, indeed, unquestionable. He told his audience that "the Government must be ready to take all measures necessary to assure the maintenance of industries essential to the safety of the State, to prevent any such industries from falling under the control of potential enemies, and to guard its manufacturers from unfair competition. And in particular it must be prepared to give especial assistance towards the maintenance and development of key industries." Now here is an excellent policy, as far as it goes, stated by a responsible Minister. It is, in fact, the policy recommended by Lord Balfour of Burleigh's committee and by every responsible body of men who can claim to represent our industries. But is there any assurance that the Government intends to carry it into practice? Can our business men lay their plans on the assumption that such will be the policy of the State? We doubt it. There has been so much dalliance and flirtation upon this subject that we require something more than speeches and declarations to convince us that the intentions of the Government are serious.

In the meantime our industries are drifting into a very unsafe position. Several of them, owing to the wages policy of the Government, are no longer upon an economic foundation. The Government is subsidising our iron industry, our coal industry, and our railways in order to conceal the deficit which their concessions have created. The amount and nature of these subsidies, if they were frankly put before the public, might give cause for alarm and reflection. Sir Albert Stanley speaks of inquiries into such questions as the supply of electric and water power. Such inquiries will produce a report; but whether that report will produce results is another question. The only way, as far as we can see, to produce industrial enterprise and activity is to offer our industries conditions of security. That security is the essential preliminary to increased production. How it is to be obtained seems to us to be a question which can only be settled in consultation with the industries themselves. And hitherto no Government has shown any signs of sincerely and attentively giving ear to the industries of the country. It seems to us, looking back upon the pitiful record of the past fifty years on this subject, that the only way in which the producers of this country can obtain the policy necessary to its security, is by organization and combination. Let them agree upon a common denominator of security, and let them unite to obtain the representation of that policy in Parliament and in the Government.

Canada's Attitude Towards the War.

THE Toronto *Statesman* of October 19, in an article entitled "Has Canada no Message?" criticizes sharply the attitude of Canada towards the war and its problems.

The question has been raised in previous issues of the *Statesman* why it is that, so far, there has been no attempt made in any responsible quarter to formulate the characteristic attitude of Canada towards the deeper problems of the war. . . . Has Canada done no thinking at all on this subject? Has Canada no individuality that can register reactions of its own to the strange incitations of the times? Must Canada be content with the humiliating position of a middleman, trafficking in exotic ideas and imported attitudes? The world is topsy-turvy. It is waiting for guidance. It is craving for inspiration. Has Canada no message? Has Canada no word to say?

That there is something wrong with Canada's relationship to the affairs of the world is a fact that seems not to have entirely escaped the observation of a portion of the press as well as of the Government. Let us briefly consider the salient characteristics of the mode of thinking of a few who have shown some concern with matters of this kind. First of all there is, of course, the school of rabid Imperialists who are never pleased with Canada because she does not burn with as combustible a love for Centralism as that with which they, themselves, are consumed. Their criticism on the present occasion, it may therefore be assumed, is simply a repetition of the old lament that Canada is not imperialistic enough. Their diagnosis is a standing one: thinness of imperialistic blood. Their nostrum is a patented, permanent cure-all: drenching doses of the imperialistic tonic. Their cult is screened against argument by a nebula of faith and fanaticism. . . .

More specious is the pseudo-logic of the Toronto *Star* in its treatment of the question. It poses as the apostle of "sweet reasonableness," and is a good representative of the class of supine reformers whose souls are stuffed with rhymed mottos, and whose mental vertebræ are made of circular truisms. It generally manages to coat its editorial garrulity with a daub of platitudinous unction, and makes the gullible reader believe that it is feeding him on a wholesome diet of liberal thought. The *Star* does not view the subject of Canada's place among the participants in the war from the angle of Imperialism. Nevertheless, it has its own goose-step music of consistency to which it is keeping time. It has its general philosophy, educed from the teachings of Rowell and his school, that the fulfilment of human destiny in this world consists in self-sacrifice—for a reward, somehow, somewhere, and sometime to be obtained. Applying this doctrine to Canada's position in the world, we are led to think that, so long as Canada has opportunities for self-sacrifice, she has no cause to grumble. It only remains to adjust the little matter of the reward. . . .

Some of the recent utterances of our Government also betray some uneasiness as to the national position of Canada. The Government has not confided to the country the reasoning whereby it arrived at the conclusion that Canada needed to be promoted to the status of a parent State. It is conceivable that the title-loving trait in Borden's character was responsible for the conferring of the putative honor upon Canada. . . . Again, possibly there was merely the matter of convenience for the persons managing the affairs of the two countries that caused the simplification of intercourse. The Canadian Government has a considerable amount of business to transact with Downing Street, and it has representatives spending a good deal of their time in England. . . .

Has Canada shown any originality throughout the war in dealing with any of the concrete issues that demanded judgment? Canada has not been constructive in the large sense that President Wilson or the British Labor party is constructive. . . . But has Canada even satisfied the more moderate test of showing intelligent judgment in the smaller concerns that have cropped up during the war? We remember, at the outbreak of the war, there was the difficulty of swallowing the incongruity of the alliance with Russia—the most despotic Government in Europe—with the democratic countries of the West, in a battle for a principle which was well known to be distasteful to Russia. . . . What was Canada's honest opinion—the opinion of a country as liberal and as free as its neighbor—on this subject? Not a trace of revulsion on her countenance. Canada took up the cue of the more sophisticated diplomacy-mongers of Europe and embarked upon a course of hypocritical adulation of Russian Czardom. . . . Then, later, what was our honest, moral opinion of the venal, despotic little Roumania, ally of ours though she was? And what did we think of the Czar after the *exposé* of his treachery? And what was the attitude of democratic Canada to the Paris Economic Conference of 1916, which was so unmistakably a traduction of the ideals for which our heroic blood has been shed? Wilson had a Wilsonian—a democratic, American opinion on this subject. The British Labor party had an opinion worthy of the traditions of English democracy on this subject. Canada, too, had an opinion—one worthy of Canada. It was generally an opinion of acquiescence; an opinion of moral turpitude. And then the great Russian revolution! Here was an event of the greatest moment in history. If the war were to produce nothing else it would have justified itself by having produced the Russian revolution, properly exploited. What response did that great event evoke in Canada? Did our national frame quiver with sympathetic joy at the glorious spectacle of the liberation of 180,000,000 slaves? Our answer was the echo of Northcliffe's answer. When it suited Northcliffe to pat the Russian revolution on the back, it suited our national conscience to pat it on the back. When it suited Northcliffe to kick it on the shins and to punch its vitals, it suited our national conscience to emulate his example. . . .

Contributors to this Issue

THE RT. HON. SIR GEORGE FOSTER is Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce.

ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER is assistant professor of history in Columbia University.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

THE report that certain international financial interests have for some time been exerting themselves to bring about peace, and have been holding secret meetings in Switzerland for that purpose, has again attracted public attention in England. The matter appears to have been first brought to public notice by the *New Europe* (London), which on August 2, 1917, published the following statement: "We learn from an unimpeachable source that the secret conference of international financiers which recently took place in Switzerland was inspired by somewhat different motives from those which were ascribed to it at the time. Acting purely in the interests of the great capitalists of all countries, it aimed, above all, at an immediate peace such as would arrest the growth of international Socialism and the rising tide of revolution throughout Europe. The gathering sought to forestall the holding of the Stockholm conference by a direct arrangement between the belligerents in which national claims would be entirely subordinated to considerations of world-wide finance. Unconscious puppets of this movement are to be found in many opposite camps, among sentimental pacifists and honestly doctrinaire Maximalists, among the numerous agents of Berlin, Vienna, Budapest, and Sofia, who swarm on Swiss soil, and among the inveterate Austrophiles and Bulgarophiles of the Entente. Some of those who are personally interested in Turkish credit stand close behind the scenes. The movement has also found some support in certain ultramontane circles which, despite their talent for intrigue, are too short-sighted to realize that the Church's only hope for the future is to lead peoples and not to follow dynasties." In a communication to the press recently issued by the British Foreign Office, all knowledge of such a conference is disclaimed. The report that a representative of Lloyds bank attended a conference at Geneva is declared to be "utterly untrue." Action in the matter is promised, however, in case any information regarding such a conference is obtained.

FINLAND is still without a settled Government. In August the Landtag voted in favor of a monarchy, and in October Prince Frederick Charles of Hesse was nominated as king. By that time, however, conditions in Finland and Germany had so far changed as to lead to the report that the Prince would never come to Helsingfors. The present Premier, Svinhufvud, is regarded as impossible as administrative head of the country because of his pro-German views, and the return to power of General Mannerheim, who is regarded as pro-Entente, is predicted. In the meantime, France has announced that while it does not refuse to recognize Finland as a sovereign State, it cannot, in view of the way in which the monarchy has been established and a ruler chosen from an enemy State, continue the former semi-official relations. Recent press dispatches report the growth of a mutinous spirit in the army, and increasing unrest over political control from Berlin and German economic penetration. A late report states that the German troops are being withdrawn from Finland.

THE peace treaty of March 7 between Germany and Finland, the text of which was printed in the *New Europe* of April 4, was followed early in July by an economic treaty, to continue in force for six months but with the expectation that it would be further extended. The provisions regarding a reciprocal "most favored nation" treatment were objected to in the Finnish Diet on the ground that they in effect opened Finnish mines, forests, waterways, and other natural resources to exploitation by German capital without insuring any corresponding advantage for Finland. The stipulation that Finland should maintain the tariff of January 1, 1914, so far as Germany was concerned, while Germany remained free to treat Finnish imports as it chose, was also declared to be one-sided; the tariff in question, practically identical with the tariff of 1859 translated from Russian into Finnish currency, being regarded as obsolete and dangerously vague. Article 16 of the treaty, under which neither country was to forbid seasonal emigration to the other, at the same time that Germany was accorded the right of establishing employment bureaus in Finland over which Finland would have no control, was also objected to. Mr. Hjelt, one of the negotiators of the treaty and later Finnish minister at Berlin, frankly admitted that the reasons for accepting such terms were political, the object being to secure the speedy suppression of the "Reds." A third treaty, announced in a press dispatch of September 7, is said to put the entire man-power of Finland (*i. e.*, of "White Guard" Finland) at the disposal of Germany and to be in effect a treaty of alliance.

ONE of the minor questions involved in the peace settlement is that of the status of the Aland Islands. The importance of the fortifications, which were reported to have been blown up last summer to prevent them from being used in aid of the Germans, has perhaps been overestimated; but the islands, commanding as they do Stockholm and the Gulf of Bothnia, have great strategic importance. Following the Crimean war, Great Britain and France forced Russia to leave the islands unfortified; and the lifting of the prohibition early in the present war contributed appreciably to the growth of "activism," or pro-Germanism, at Stockholm. On March 2, following the Germanization of "White Guard" Finland, Germany occupied the islands. The German occupation had the effect of weakening pro-German influence at Stockholm and intensifying the demand for Swedish control. In the negotiations with Germany over the agreements supplementary to the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Russia is said to have expressed its willingness to leave the Aland Islands to Sweden in case Finland was allowed to take eastern Karelia. On September 8 a meeting of islanders at Stockholm resulted in the formation of an association to support the Swedish claim.

AN international conference, representing the shipping and insurance interests of the Scandinavian countries, met at Copenhagen on October 2. One of the objects of the conference, which was called at the suggestion of Holland, is to obtain at the close of the war a general revision of the decisions of prize courts and consuls which have borne heavily upon neutral trade. The proceedings of the conference have not been made public.

THE *Revue Baltique*, the first number of which was published in September, is to be devoted to the political, economic, and literary interests of the Letts, the Lithuanians, and the Esthonians. The review is to appear monthly at Paris under the editorship of Arthur Toupine.

A PROTEST against the reëstablishment of the former kingdom of Poland has been issued by the Lithuanian National Council at Washington. The interest and sympathies of the Lithuanians, together with those of the Letts, the Esthonians, and the Finns, it is declared, centre about the shores of the Baltic Sea and in the Scandinavian countries, while the Poles and other Slavic peoples find a natural outlet for their activities in eastern and southeastern Europe towards the Adriatic and the Black seas. The Lithuanian National Council urges the Allied Governments to support the formation of an independent federation of states bordering the Baltic, in order to safeguard the Baltic against German domination.

THE texts, originally published in the Bolshevik paper *Pravda*, of the agreements concluded in 1915 and 1917 between Russia, France and Great Britain concerning territorial rearrangements in Turkey and elsewhere, have been reprinted in the *Asie Française*. The agreements involved Russia's claim to Constantinople, the Dardanelles, and other territories in the Near East, and the counterclaims of France and Great Britain to special rights in those regions. The agreements were accepted by Italy upon its entry into the war, on condition that the victorious conclusion of the war should satisfy the Italian demands, especially in the East, and give to Italy the same rights as Great Britain and France in the territories conceded to those countries. It has been suggested that the immediate occasion of the present publication in France of these documents was the successful Allied military operations in Syria and Palestine, and the consequent possibility of carrying into effect the agreements so far as France and Great Britain are concerned.

THAT not even the shadow of Ottoman suzerainty should be allowed to continue in any part of the Turkish Empire in which there is not a preponderant Turkish population, is the opinion of Sir Mark Sykes, M. P., who contributes two letters on "The Problem of the Near East" to recent issues of the London *Daily News*. On the other hand, every care should be taken that the Turkish possessions shall not become the prey of Western monopolists. "Free trade throughout and the principle of the open door should be observed in its strictest sense so far as the Allies and neutrals are concerned." In opposition to the plan of an international board, which, while it may "control a city or a waterway, collect a given revenue, or hold a fortress," "cannot develop a people or administer a country," the writer proposes to make individual nations responsible for the political development of individual areas. As for the Dardanelles and Turkish finances in general, Sir Mark Sykes suggests a settlement "on a broad international basis" by "Allied democracy taking direct joint control."

A RECENT issue (No. 3) of *Italy To-day*, a fortnightly bulletin published by the Italian Bureau of Public Information at New York, calls attention to the extensive reclamation of swamp lands lately completed by the Italian Government. The drained area now comprises 4,537,500 acres, or one-fifteenth of the entire productive area of the country. The total cost of the undertaking has been about 700,000,000 lire ($140,000,000), of which 373,058,000 lire ($74,811,000) has been furnished by the Government and the remainder by the provinces and local communities. Most of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reclamation work is being done in the region of Emilia. In the province of Ferrara, where 62,500 acres formerly completely submerged have been reclaimed, the value of the land has been increased by more than 25,000,000 lire ($5,000,000).

THE electoral programme of the Irish Labor party adopts "the principles of the Russian revolution, supported as they are by the pronouncements of President Wilson and the premiers and politicians of all the warring and neutral Powers, namely, 'the right of all peoples to self-determination'", and interprets those principles as meaning "that Ireland, no less than Belgium or Serbia, Poland or Finland, Bohemia or Esthonia, and these no less than Ireland, shall have the right to decide its own form of government, to choose its own sovereignty, to determine its own destinies without limitations, except such as are voluntarily conceded or are common to all nations." In view of the continuance of coercion and the threat of conscription, to the latter of which the party is firmly opposed, "the National Executive has decided by a unanimous vote that the members of the Irish Labor party shall refuse to attend the House of Commons." In case circumstances shall arise which dictate a change of policy in this respect, the change is to be determined by a special national congress.

INTERNATIONAL topics occupy a prominent place in the syllabus of public lectures arranged by the University of London for the winter session. Professor A. F. Pollard is to give three lectures on "The League of Nations," and a course of seven lectures on "The British Empire and a League of Nations" is to be given by various lecturers, including G. P. Gooch, A. E. Zimmern, F. J. C. Hearnshaw, and Ernest Barker. At Mr. Zimmern's lecture Mr. Asquith is to preside. One of the lectures in this course will be by Dr. A. P. Newton, on "America and a World Settlement." Other courses announced are on "International Relations from the Sociological Point of View," by Professor L. T. Hobhouse, and on "International Treaties," by Sir John Macdonell. The annual Creighton lecture, to be given on November 7 by Professor Gilbert Murray, with Lord Bryce in the chair, will have for its subject "Aristophanes and Cleon, or the Contemporary Criticism of the Peloponnesian War."

AT a meeting at Washington, on October 11, of the International High Commission established to carry into effect the financial recommendations of the first Pan-American Congress, it was reported that a sufficient number of the States of North and Central America and the West Indies had ratified the Buenos Ayres convention of 1910, for the protection of trade marks, to insure the establishment of the Havana bureau for which the convention provided. The Cuban Congress has made the necessary appropriation, and a bill authorizing the Commissioner of Patents to put the convention into effect in this country is now before Congress. The opening of a registration bureau at Rio Janeiro awaits the ratification of the convention by two more South American States.

A FAR Eastern division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has just been created in the Department of Trade and Commerce, for the purpose of encouraging the development of commercial relations between the United States and the countries bordering on the Pacific. Information regarding the needs of Far Eastern regions, their systems of credit, their buying and selling markets, etc., is to be made available for American buyers and sellers; and commercial attachés in the Far East are also to be available for assistance.

THE first official study of the problem of reconstruction to be published in the United States has been issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce, under the title "Economic Reconstruction, with Analysis of Main Tendencies in the Principal Belligerent Countries of Europe." Statistics of production, consumption and trade in important foodstuffs and industrial raw materials, the extension of Government participation in trade and industry, and the work of post-war economic commissions in Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary and Japan, are discussed in the monograph. An introduction by Burwell S. Cutler, the chief of the Bureau, emphasizes the fact that many of the plans for economic reconstruction in Europe are unsuited to the United States and may, if administered in a narrow spirit, prove prejudicial to the interests of the United States in foreign fields.

THE following summary of Mr. Samuel Gompers's visit to Europe as head of an American labor mission is of interest in view of the plans for a celebration in his honor, to take place at Chicago early in November. On August 28 Mr. Gompers landed at Liverpool, where he was welcomed by the American Consul and the acting Lord Mayor. On his arrival at London he was met by Mr. G. N. Barnes, M. P., Labor member of the War Cabinet; Mr. W. Brace, M. P., Under Secretary to the Home Office; the American Consul General, and Mr. James Sexton, a labor leader. A guard of police, acting under orders from the War Office, prevented the public and members of the press from coming on the platform. Mr. Gompers later received the newspaper men at the Savoy Hotel. On the next day, he visited his birthplace at Spitalfields, East London, and called upon Major General Biddle at the American army headquarters and upon Major Endicott at the American Red Cross. The first official function occurred on August 30, when Mr. Gompers and the mission were the guests of the Government at a luncheon at the Carleton Hotel. Mr. Barnes presided and addresses of welcome were made by Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Milner, and Mr. Chamberlain. During the first week of September Mr. Gompers attended the Trades Union Congress at Derby. On his return to London, September 10, he received a delegation of journalists at his hotel and on the same day was entertained by the American Luncheon Club. He visited Edinburgh on September 11, under the auspices of the Scottish War Aims Committee, where the party were the guests at dinner of the Edinburgh Corporation; later, Mr. Gompers addressed a public meeting at which the Lord Provost presided. On September 12 he was at Blackpool, and the following day spoke at a meeting at Glasgow. From the 17th to the 19th of September he attended the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist Conference at London. On the 22nd he addressed a special meeting of the London Trades Council. The next day he had a private interview with the King at Buckingham Palace, and later the members of the mission were received by the King and Queen. The party then left for Paris, where they were welcomed by the Secretary of the American Embassy and representatives of the American army and navy and of the French Government. On September 25 Mr. Gompers met a number of Socialist and labor leaders at the headquarters of the Confédération Général du Travail, and was entertained by M. Stephen Pichon, Minister of Foreign Affairs, at a luncheon at which were present M. Colliard, Minister of Labor, M. André Tardieu of the French High Commission, and Premier Clemenceau. On the same day Mr. Gompers was received by the American Club, attended a reception at the Confédération du Livre, called upon Marshal Joffre, and had an audience with President Poincaré, to whom he was introduced by Ambassador Sharp. In the evening he attended an informal banquet and reception given in his honor by the officers of the Confédération Général du Travail. His official reception by the Confédération took place the following day, and on September 27 he was entertained by the canteen of the Citroën factories at a luncheon, at which were present M. Tardieu and Ambassador Sharp. On September 28 he visited the American front, and later visited the Belgian front and was received by King Albert. On October 4 he attended a meeting of the French Socialist deputies, and on the sixth was the guest of the labor deputies at a reception at the Palais Bourbon. Following this the mission left for Italy, visited the Italian front, and arrived at Rome on October 8. The next day Mr. Gompers attended a reception given by representatives of the Italian press.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandinavian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Argentine Ambassador.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Greatest Story Any American Ever Had to Tell

To be published November 23rd

The first authentic, informing account of the A. E. F.—its building, training, fighting and great effort from May, 1917, until the end of September, 1918. A vivid story of what our boys actually did at the Front—the things they cannot write us.

AMERICA IN FRANCE

By
MAJOR FREDERICK PALMER

FREDERICK PALMER you know as America's leading war-correspondent, author of "My Year of the Great War" and "My Second Year of the War." As a Major on Pershing's staff in the very center of American activities in France since the beginning, he has had exceptional opportunities of observing the growth of our achievement. His "America in France" is our first opportunity of understanding what actually happened in the field. It is not a newspaper story of dashes over the top, but a vivid, authentic account of that bigger thing—the organization of the A. E. F. and its operations in battle. It is an authentic story of America's part in the war that will be just as interesting ten years from now as it is to-day. Major Palmer has written of the work of every Division—the 42nd (Rainbow), the 26th (New England) and so on down the entire list, even as recently as their fighting in the Argonne at the end of September of this year. Our boys may write of what they've had to eat, the socks they wear, and the battles they cannot get, but they cannot tell us what Frederick Palmer can of what they have actually been doing as soldiers.
This is *the* book for Americans, and the first one, about their boys over there. $1.60

ELIZABETH'S CAMPAIGN
By Mrs. Humphry Ward

A fine romance of a supremely critical moment in English life and the war. Within hearing of the Flanders guns, an impetuous, perverse, yet Puckishly humorous Englishman, a conservative of the old school, refused to lend England his aid, until awakened to a consciousness of war by his very efficient and very lovable secretary. *By the author of 'Missing.'* $1.50

DR. ADRIAAN
By Louis Couperus

The long-awaited fourth volume of *The Books of the Small Souls*—the interesting story of the large soul which grew up among the small souls—Addie, the son of Constance and Van der Welcke. *By the author of "The Twilight of the Souls," "Old People and the Things that Pass," etc.* $1.50

WHERE YOUR HEART IS
By Beatrice Harraden

War's regeneration of an avaricious woman—a novel of great strength and truth, showing the tremendous spiritual change war has wrought in the individual. *By the author of "Ships that Pass in the Night."* $1.50

THE BETROTHAL:
A Sequel to "The Bluebird"
By Maurice Maeterlinck

All lovers of "The Bluebird" will want to read of the adventures of Tyltyl in his search for a sweetheart. The same delicacy of fancy which has endeared Maeterlinck's work to all of us characterizes "The Betrothal." Its publication is coincident with its reproduction at the Little Theatre in New York by Winthrop Ames. $1.50

LEO TOLSTOY
By Alymer Maude

The authoritative biography of the great Russian idealist by one who knew him intimately for years. A condensation of his two-volume life of Tolstoy entirely rewritten, admirable in its portrayal of those events and mental developments which to the great writer himself seemed of crucial importance. $2.50

SOLDIERS OF THE SEA:
The Story of the U. S. Marine Corps
By Willis J. Abbot

The authoritative story of our crack fighting corps, the boys who did that wonderful fighting at Chateau-Thierry, and their exploits from Decatur's days to our own days. It has been *highly commended by Major Sterrett of the Marine Corps.* *Illustrated,* $1.50

CHRIST IN YOU

A remarkable message from a psychic—so convincing and so consoling, that people everywhere are asking "Have you read *Christ in You*"? It has sold thousands in England. By the author of *"Spiritual Reconstruction."* $1.00

THE ADVANCE OF ENGLISH POETRY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY By William Lyon Phelps, Ph.D.

Where to find and how to enjoy the best contemporary poetry of England, Ireland, and America. Animated, interesting discussions by a noted critic. $1.50

New Publications

Dodd, Mead and Company, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED